Faculty of Arts
University of Helsinki

PRACTICING MUSEUMS

MUSEUM PEOPLE, MUSEUM WORK AND CHANGE IN PRACTICE

Inkeri Hakamies

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

To be presented for public discussion with the permission of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Helsinki, in Hall 1, Metsätalo, on the 15th of October 2021 at 13 o'clock.

HELSINKI 2021

Supervision by

Prof. Hanna Snellman
Prof. Suzie Thomas

Preliminary Examiners

Associate Prof. Lizette Gradén
Associate Prof. Chiara Zuanni

Opponent

Associate Prof. Chiara Zuanni

ALFRED KORDELININ SÄÄTIÖ

Doctoral Programme in History and Cultural Heritage

Unigrafia
Helsinki 2021

ISBN 978-951-51-7517-5 (paperback)
ISBN 978-951-51-7518-2 (PDF)

The Faculty of Arts uses the Urkund system (plagiarism recognition) to examine all doctoral dissertations.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

The place where I first entered the professional museum field was the Seurasaari Open Air Museum, in 2006. The museum was founded in 1909 on an island next to Helsinki following the example of Skansen in Stockholm, and it is an idyllic place with forest, rocks, the surrounding sea and the cityscape of Helsinki on the opposite shore. The museum buildings — old farmhouses brought from different regions of Finland — comprise a new sort of Finnish village where everything is wonderfully old and nostalgic. The place is also connected to my family history — but with a twist! Working as a guard in one the museum houses was my first proper summer job, as it had been for my mother in the early 1970s. In my job interview — carried out by my mother's previous colleague — I was asked if I knew any traditional handicraft techniques, with the desire being that the guards would 'enliven' the museum houses by performing crafts. This was very amusing to my mother, who remembered that back in her day the museum guards were forbidden from doing anything other than sell tickets and stand guard, but she would secretly copy the embroidery from the sleeve of her uniform — a Finnish national costume — and hide her needlework in a nearby butter churn whenever there were visitors.

Museums like Seurasaari are part of national (museum) histories and the histories of the people who inhabited the houses and made and used the objects on display, but they also have their own histories as lived and used spaces: Seurasaari has been guarded and visited by many generations, all of whom have left a mark — at least metaphorically. I cannot claim that the topic of my research was clear from the beginning, but I have always found the stories of what people used to do in museums fascinating. I believe the life that takes place in museums is also deserving of more academic attention.[1]

[1] Incidentally, folklorist Maija Auramies analysed the oral traditions of the employees of the Seurasaari Open-Air Museum in her master's thesis (2013).

I would like to acknowledge those who have helped me on my way, first of all my supervisors, Professor and Vice Rector Hanna Snellman, and Professor Suzie Thomas. I have had two 'good cops' who have alternatively encouraged me, pushed me and let me be, in exactly the right proportions. Thank you, Hanna, for always thinking my ideas are great, and thank you, Suzie, for helping me make them even better!

I would also like to thank the reviewers of my research articles and of the final doctoral dissertation. The comments that I have received from my anonymous reviewers and the editors of the journals to which I have submitted articles have been productive and have encouraged me to polish my arguments. My preliminary examiners, Associate Professor Lizette Gradén and Associate Professor Chiara Zuanni, have given me precise and constructive feedback, which has been most helpful in the final stages.

I am most grateful to Juha Nirkko from the Finnish Literature Society, Maritta Mellais from the Finnish National Gallery, Pirkko Hakala from the Finnish Heritage Agency, Anna Alavuotunki, amanuensis of the Vantaa City Museum at the time, and Eeva-Liisa Taivassalo from the Finnish Museums Association for aiding me in the use of their archival material. I also want to thank Ildikó Lehtinen, curator emerita of the Museum of Cultures, for sharing her stories and always encouraging newcomers to the museum field. I am also most obliged to the Alfred Kordelin Foundation and the University of Helsinki for their financial support.

During my PhD studies I have participated in the research seminar on European Ethnology, chaired in turn by Hanna Snellman, Pia Olsson and Katriina Siivonen, and the research seminar for Cultural Heritage, European Ethnology and Museum Studies (CHEEMS), chaired by Coppélie Cocq and Suzie Thomas. I am also thankful to Professor Thomas Thiemeyer for welcoming me as a Gastdoktorandin in the Ludwig-Uhland-Institut (LUI) für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft in Tübingen. I would like to thank everyone involved for using their valuable time to read and comment on my manuscripts and for giving me invaluable feedback. I am also grateful for suggestions I have received in other instances: The idea for my article, 'The Dusty Museum', was more or less pointed out to me in the PhD seminar Composing Cultural Analysis (2015), and for that I owe thanks to Robert Willim, Morten Krogh Petersen and everyone else in my working group.

Being a PhD student can be lonely, and I appreciate everyone who has made me feel part of a community: my office roommate Oscar Ortiz-Nieminen, the Topelia and LUI lunch groups, the virtual hoffice groups of the CHEEMS and the Doctoral Programme in History and Cultural Heritage, and my book club — my support group in life.

I also want to thank my family, especially my parents, Marja and Pekka, who have both inspired me in their own ways, and watched my babies when I have been skipping out to libraries or conferences. To my husband, Robert, I want to say: thank you for all the support and encouragement, including back rubs, your genuine interest, for giving me time and space — especially in the time of COVID — and everything else. I am also grateful to my two children, who did not help one bit.

In Sindelfingen, 9 August 2021

Inkeri Hakamies

ABSTRACT

The main task of this doctoral dissertation is to ascertain how museums are practiced and defined through social practices. This has been done in three research articles, in which I have discussed how some people, various tasks and museums have been valued as more or less 'museal' than others in the Finnish museum field of the late 20th century.

The empirical material included in this study consists of biographical interviews, in which museum professionals reminisced about their careers in the Finnish museum field, and responses to a questionnaire, in which museum visitors shared their museum memories. The former part is larger in size and has also been emphasised more in my analysis. Both parts of the material are products of a Finnish Museum History Project, carried out between 2005 and 2011. The questionnaire 'Minun museomuistoni' (My Museum Memories) was produced by the Finnish Literature Archive, and the interviews were carried out by various volunteers from the museum field.

The material covers the last decades of the 20th century and the first years of the 21st century. The time period brought many changes to museum work practices and to the ways museums function in a society, the effects of which are still present in today's museum field. For example, many new museum professions were created and museological and conservational education and training were developed. Museums also adopted marketing and different digital tools, which meant that the professional skills of those working in museums were challenged. The roles and responsibilities of museums were also subjected to new debates.

The museum field has and needs shared standards and guidelines, but in this study, I recognise the plurality of museum practices and interpret them within practice theory framework as things that people do that have shared meanings for the practitioners. Thus, the things that people do in museums are controlled by official rules, but they are also a part of tradition and have personal meaning in the lives of the people who carry them out.

In my research, I discovered that the practices and their shared meanings can create hierarchies that define whose work is more ‘museal’, which in turn can influence the professional identity of their practitioners: the ‘real museum people’ are those who do ‘real museum work’. A change in everyday museum practices is also part of something bigger: a change in ideologies and museum views, and a change in the working community and its dynamics. Studying museum practices as social and cultural practices and lived phenomena allows us to examine more critically where our different ideas of museums come from and how they influence the way museums function.

TIIVISTELMÄ

Tämän väitöskirjan päätehtävänä on selvittää, miten museoita harjoitetaan ja miten ne määritellään käytäntöjen kautta. Analyysini johtoajatuksena on ollut väistellä museoiden tai museoammattilaisten virallisia määritelmiä ja tarkastella, miten ne määrittyvät ihmisten puheessa ja toiminnassa. Tämä tutkimustehtävä on jaettu kolmeen alatehtävään: miten jotkin ihmiset, työtehtävät ja museot on arvioitu enemmän tai vähemmän "museaalisiksi" kuin toiset 1900-luvun lopun suomalaisella museokentällä. Olen tarkastellut näitä kysymyksiä tähän väitöskirjaan sisällytetyissä kolmessa tutkimusartikkelissa.

Tutkimukseni empiirinen aineisto koostuu elämänkerrallisista haastatteluista, joissa museoammattilaiset muistelevat uraansa suomalaisella museokentällä, sekä kyselyvastauksista, joissa museokävijät kertovat museomuistoistaan. Näistä ensimmäinen on määrällisesti suurempi ja tutkimukseni kannalta keskeisempi. Aineiston molemmat osat on tuotettu osana Suomen museohistoria -hanketta, joka toteutettiin vuosina 2005–2011. Minun museomuistoni -kyselyn toteutti Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Keruuarkisto. Museoammattilaisten puolistrukturoidut haastattelut on toteutettu vapaaehtoisvoimin ja ne on arkistoitu eri museoiden ja arkistojen toimesta.

Tutkimusaineistoni kattaa 1900-luvun viimeiset vuosikymmenet ja 2000-luvun vaihteen, joten tutkimukseni käsittelee suomalaisen museoalan lähihistoriaa. Kyseinen ajanjakso toi monia muutoksia museoammattilaisten käytäntöihin ja työtapoihin sekä museoiden rooliin yhteiskunnassa. Näiden vaikutukset ovat edelleen läsnä museoalalla. 1900-luvun loppupuolella luotiin monia uusia museoammatteja, museotyöntekijöiden määrä lisääntyi ja museologian koulutusta kehitettiin. Museot ottivat myös käyttöönsä markkinointiin ja tietotekniikkaan liittyviä työtapoja, mikä haastoi museoissa työskentelevien aiemman ammattitaidon.

Museokentällä on yhteisiä, tarpeellisia standardeja ja ohjeita, jotka määrittävät miten museotyötä tehdään, mutta tässä tutkimuksessa painotan museokäytäntöjen moninaisuutta ja tulkitsen niitä käytäntöteorian viitekehyksessä ihmisten tekeminä asioina, joilla on jaettuja merkityksiä niiden harjoittajille. Museokäytäntöjä rajoittavat viralliset ohjeistukset, mutta ne ovat myös osa työyhteisöjen perinteitä, ja niillä voi olla henkilökohtaista merkitystä niitä toteuttavien ihmisten elämässä.

Tutkimuksessani havaitsin, että museokäytännöt ja niiden jaetut merkitykset muodostavat hierarkioita, jotka määrittelevät, kenen työ nähdään "museaalisempana" kuin toisten, mikä puolestaan voi vaikuttaa museoammattilaisten ammatti-identiteettiin: "aidot museoihmiset" ovat niitä, jotka tekevät "aitoa museotyötä". Muutos arkipäivän museokäytännöissä heijastelee myös muutosta museoita koskevissa ideologioissa sekä työyhteisöissä ja niiden dynamiikassa. Museokäytäntöjen tarkasteleminen sosiaalisina ja kulttuurisina käytäntöinä ja elävänä, koettuna ilmiönä antaa mahdollisuuden tutkia kriittisemmin, mihin erilaiset museonäkemykset pohjautuvat ja miten ne vaikuttavat museoiden toimintaan.

LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

This dissertation is based on the following publications:

I. Hakamies, Inkeri (2017). 'Practice Makes "Museum People".' *Museum & Society*, 15 (2), 142–152. https://doi.org/10.29311/mas.v15i2.829.

II. Hakamies, Inkeri (2018). 'The Dusty Museum.' *Nordisk museologi*, 2018 (1), 74–88. https://doi.org/10.5617/nm.6399.

III. Hakamies, Inkeri (2019). '"Real Museum Work" and Information Technology – Does not Compute!' *Ethnologia Fennica*, 46, 36–60. https://doi.org/10.23991/ef.v46i0.7423.

1. INTRODUCTION

WHAT'S IN A MUSEUM?

The inspiration for ethnological studies often spurs from the researcher's personal interests, and ethnologists tend to study topics already familiar to them (Jouhki & Steel 2016, 27; Snellman 1999, 137–138). It would be dishonest to claim that the initial motivation for this study was anything but personal: I had graduated from European ethnology and was taking my first career steps in museums but was also curious about academic life, and I thought that studying museums would combine both of my interests. When browsing the topics of questionnaires from the Finnish Heritage Agency and the Finnish Literature Society, two headlines caught my eye: Esinekeruusta entisaikaan (About Collecting Artefacts in Former Times), from 1978, and 'Minun museomuistoni' (My Museum Memories), from 2007. The latter questionnaire guided me to a larger pool of material, as it was carried out as part of a National Museum of Finland history project, which also included interviews with museum professionals. Thus, as my broad topic I chose the Finnish museum field and its recent history as it has been experienced and remembered by individuals.

I began working on this research project in 2013, and for at least the first four years I kept saying that I was still at the beginning stage. This was not entirely untrue, because my research has had several beginnings. One clear starting point was formulating the initial research goals. In earlier research proposals, I had proclaimed that I wanted to discover what the actions of individuals reveal about shared museum practices and museum ideals, and how different agent groups — such as museum professionals and museum activists — have viewed their role in the museum field. However, when becoming more familiar with the research material, one usually realises it is about something else than the initial research questions would suggest, and this is when the research really begins.

In hindsight, my research task began to take shape when I presented the rough draft of my first article in the ethnological research seminar. I received friendly, constructive and reasonable advice to include a definition of museums' functions in my text, and perhaps refer to the definition by the International Council of Museums (ICOM). ICOM's view is that museums should be non-profit and permanent institutions 'in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment' (ICOM 2007).

However, I was reluctant to do so and realised the reason for this was that clearly museums represent many different things for the people discussed in the material, and I wanted readers to see all the different ways that the shapes and functions of a museum can be understood. Some of the views of the interviewees and questionnaire respondents were in line with 'official' definitions of a museum, but others more or less explicitly challenged such definitions, meaning the findings revealed different ways of defining 'museal' in different contexts. Privately owned collections, for example, do not fit into the definition by ICOM, but the fact that their owners might call them museums, and thus desire to attach them to the same phenomenon, also says something. I did not want to tie the definition of a museum down just by referring to the authority of ICOM, but rather to explore museum and museal as cultural concepts based on the respondents' views.

The forms and definitions of museums have also been continuously evolving. Since the very first royal collections and cabinets of curiosity, museums have taken on different functions and assumed very different shapes. All museums have different origin stories, some of which might resemble each other: some of the currently public museums started out as private collections, some as national undertakings. As Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett has noted, museums of today can be vaults and treasure rooms, schools dedicated to the creation of an informed citizenry, forums for public debate, advocates for preservation, tribunals, theatres, memorials, places to mourn or tourist attractions 'complete with cafes, shops, films, performances and exhibitions' (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998, 138–139). The list goes on. Interestingly, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett points out that a museum can also be an ‘artifact to be displayed in its own right, along with its history, operations, understandings, and practices’ (1998, 138–139).

The questions of how a museum should be defined and who has the right to do so are not insignificant, but are, in fact, at the core of museum politics. The official definitions must also keep up with times, and in 2017 the ICOM established a Committee on Museum Definition, Prospects and Potentials (MDPP) to explore ‘the profoundly dissimilar conditions, values and practices of museums in diverse and rapidly changing societies’, with the aim being to eventually formulate a new, more current definition of a museum (ICOM 2007). Based on the MDPP’s work, in 2019 the Executive Board of ICOM suggested that an alternative museum definition be put to the vote at the Kyoto General Assembly. The suggested definition claimed, for example, that ‘[M]useums are democratising, inclusive and polyphonic spaces for critical dialogue about the pasts and the futures’ (ICOM 2007). However, some members of the ICOM felt the wording of the whole suggestion was too ambiguous, which could cause difficulties in countries where the ICOM’s definition has the force of law and can influence decisions about museum funding (Ehanti, Turtiainen, & Patokorpi 2019). Thus, the vote was postponed. Most resistance, however, was aimed at the way in which the whole defining process had been handled, and in the end the conflict led to the resignation of the president of ICOM, Suay Aksoy, and other board members (Ehanti 2020).

Defining what a museum is or is not affects the structure of the heritage field through funding policies, as state subsidies are only appointed to those museums that fill the official criteria for a museum. It also affects the everyday lives of those working in museums. Most museum professionals commit themselves to certain official standards, such as the ICOM’s code of ethics and the statutes – which includes a definition for museums and museum professionals — but they are also bound by the traditions and ideas of their own institutions, societies and communities, which likewise affect their practices. As Halona Norton-Westbrook (2015, 350) has pointed out, the ‘museum world is characterized by singularity’, and no two museum institutions are identical in their typology, scale, focus or mission. Each museum is also influenced by its place in history and politics, and these factors shape the museum’s ‘internal mandates on everything from collections care to the hierarchy of personnel’ (Norton-Westbrook 2015, 350). They are also reflected in the ideas and beliefs that guide museum work: ‘Each curator’s approach is distinctive, born out of a combination of individual expertise, personal, and cultural values, interaction with peers and colleagues, and institutional expectations’ (Norton-Westbrook 2015, 350).

Despite the lengthy and extensive efforts to standardise museum work practices and democratise and share the knowledge possessed by museums and curators, many researchers have claimed that museums professionals of the 21st century still carry much tacit information regarding their work, and therefore university-based training alone may be poor preparation for the work that actually takes place in museums (Robbins 2017, Robbins 2020, 60–61; McCarthy 2015, xxxviii; Thomas, Wessman, & Heikkilä 2018, 345). As Nina Robbins claims, there are still plenty of ‘unwritten customs and care-taking procedures in the field of collection management that are upheld but have not been officially documented’, and they are ‘very much rooted in everyday museum practices’ (Robbins 2020, 60). The tacit information that museum professionals bring to bear in their work is valuable capital that should not be ignored (Robbins 2020, 64). The museum field has acknowledged that in the forthcoming years, the generation of ‘baby boomers’ will be retiring and invaluable knowledge about the collections might be lost (e.g. Reidla 2018, 129). Efforts have been made to prevent this from happening, and, for example, in 2020 the Finnish Labour Museum Werstas together with the Finnish Postal Museum carried out a project called ‘Hiljainen tieto kiertoon muistiorganisaatiossa’ (Spreading tacit knowledge in memory organisations) in order to develop a means to save and share the hidden knowledge accumulated over the years by senior museum professionals (Rohunen 2020).

Tacit or practical knowledge is also interesting from another standpoint: it reflects and transmits norms, values and ideals. According to Robbins, museum professionals’ everyday discussions about ‘prioritizing decisions regarding collection work, the in-situ selection of guiding styles or emphasizing various research goals’ are often value-based discussions by their very nature. The values ‘also become visible in larger issues, e.g. when discussing the role of the museum as part of a city’s strategic structure’ (Robbins 2020, 64). Thus, when talking about issues and practices related to museums, one is also reflecting some sort of idea of a museum. As Hanneleena Hieta reminds us, the museum as an institution is more than any single concrete museum out there – it is also an abstract concept. When founding a new museum, people make use of the idea of a museum they already have in their heads (Hieta 2012, 31). Furthermore, they usually have an idea of how to 'do' a museum 'right'.

According to Christian Bueger (2017, 126–127), practice theorists conclude that to better understand where norms come from, 'we have to study broader, collectively shared patterns of meaning and how they relate to situations of action' and observe how these patterns are 'constituted by practical knowledge enacted in doing and sayings'. In this article-based dissertation, I examine museum practices as social and cultural practices that can be done 'rightly' or 'wrongly' and carry meanings for the people who share such practices.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND MATERIAL

The empirical material discussed in this study consists of biographical interviews with museum professionals about their careers in the Finnish museum field and of questionnaire responses in which museum visitors shared their museum memories. The former dataset is larger in size and can be considered the primary focus of my analysis. Both parts of the material are products of a Finnish Museum History Project, carried out between 2005 and 2011. Though the fields of art museums and museums of cultural history might have some differences, in this study they are not treated separately. I share Halona Norton-Westbrook's conviction that 'there is unexplored commonality to be found between the curatorial work performed in museums of art, science, history, and anthropology, and that disciplinary boundaries are often more fluid than they appear' (Norton-Westbrook 2015, 342). On the other hand, different organisational structures and circumstances 'contribute substantially to the formation of the curator's ideas, beliefs, and sense of identity' (Norton-Westbrook 2015, 349). Due to the nature of the material, the museums at which the interviewees in this study work are mostly national institutions located in the capital area of Finland. Although some of the interviewees had worked in museums of different sizes during their career, it must be noted that the circumstances and practices of persons working in smaller institutions might differ from those represented here.

This study deals with the recent history of the Finnish museum field: the material covers the late 20th century, which was a period of numerous changes to museum work practices and the ways museums function in society, the effects of which are still present in today's museum field. For example, many new museum professions were created, museum staff increased in numbers and museological and conservational education and training programmes were developed. Museums also adopted marketing practices and different digital tools, which meant that the professional skills of those working in museums were challenged.

The main task of this dissertation is to ascertain how museums are practiced and how a museum is defined in practice. To elaborate: What are the practices that define a museum? What does a museum definition look like when studied through the conceptions and practices of the individuals associated with museums? I tackle the questions by further asking how museum practices are evaluated in the material, and how some people, work tasks, and museums have been valued as more or less 'museal' than others in the Finnish museum field of the late 20th century. In this setting, 'museal' is understood as an adjective, meaning that something is 'museum-like' (for other definitions of 'museal', see, e.g. Desvallées & Mairesse 2010). The questions of how different people and work tasks in the museum field are seen as more museum-like than others have to do with professional identity and hierarchies in the museum field – who does the title 'museum professional' refer to and what constitutes professional knowledge and skills in the museum context? What if a key component of the defining traits and practices changes? These topics are dealt with in Article I and Article II from different points of view (see Table 1 and Table 3).

Ideas about the right kind of professionalism in the museum field are also tied to ideas regarding just what is at the core of the right kind of museum. Whereas Article I and Article III discuss the hierarchies of people and work tasks in the museum field, Article II discusses the hierarchies of different types of museums. The question of how some museums are evaluated as being more ‘museal’ than others is explored through the concept of dust: What does it mean to call a museum dusty? (Table 2).

Table 1. Composition of Article I

Article I	‘Practice Makes “Museum People”’ (2017)
Research Question	How does carrying out certain museum work practices affect museum professionals’ identities?
Material	Ten interviews with museum professionals
Key Concept	Communities of Practice

Table 2. Composition of Article II

Article II	‘The Dusty Museum’ (2018)
Research Questions	What makes a museum ‘dusty’? What sort of element is dust in museum practices?
Material	Three interviews with museum professionals and seven questionnaire responses by museum visitors
Key Concept	Elements of Practice

Table 3. Composition of Article III

Article III	'"Real Museum Work" and Information Technology – Does not Compute!' (2019)
Research Question	What happens when something in the practices that is tied to ideas about museums and museum professionalism changes?
Material	Nine interviews with museum professionals and short articles published in *Museopolitiikka* (Museum Politics)
Key Concept	Change in Practices

STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

This dissertation consists of a synthesis containing six chapters and three research articles. The articles are all single-authored articles that have been published in peer-reviewed open access journals. In Chapter 1, I will briefly introduce the research topic and the research questions. In Chapter 2, I will provide a review of previous studies in museum history and professional cultures and explain how my study fits into these genres. It also provides a brief overview of developments in the Finnish museum field in the 20th century. In Chapter 3, I describe the background and aims of the National Museum of Finland history project, present the empirical material that this study is based on, as well as the process of gathering the material, and discuss the challenges and ethical questions regarding its use. In Chapter 4, I describe my methodology and the process that led me to focus on the above-mentioned topics, and I introduce the key analytical concepts derived from the framework of practice theory. Chapter 5 presents the findings of the research articles and Chapter 6 offers a summary of the whole research project.

2. STUDYING MUSEUMS

WHAT IS GOING ON IN MUSEUMS?

Imagine a museum exhibition portraying museum life – what aspects, objects or dioramas would it possibly display? Archaeologists excavating Stone Age dwellings, museum men in their offices smoking pipes, measuring and documenting ethnological objects, art historians discussing how paintings should be arranged and hung on the exhibition walls, or museum storage rooms with endless shelves full of objects in cardboard boxes and fabrics rolled up in silk papers? Would there be handwritten catalogues and index cards, cotton gloves, cameras and stacks of research literature on display, maybe something to show the evolution of various forms of multimedia used in exhibitions? Would it show the grand openings of new exhibitions, with a soundscape of festive speeches, continuous chit-chat and wine corks popping, or people sitting at their computers or in staff meetings (or at their computers attending an online staff meeting)? What is clear is that museums and museum events are not the same now as they were 40 or 100 years ago. As a cultural institution and as a workplace, the museum has changed.

In addition to other stories, museums are also always representing their own histories. In her essay, 'Telling, Showing, Showing Off', Mieke Bal claims that the American Museum of Natural History is a *metamuseum*, a museum of the museum: a preserve not only for endangered species for but 'the museal preservation of a project ruthlessly dated and belonging to an age long gone whose ideological goals have been subjected to extensive critique' (Bal 1992, 560). Bal (1992, 583) suggests, for example, that the 'combination of authentic artifacts presented as realistic details, and life-size puppets representing otherness in a frozen posture, obviously belongs to what the museum, in its metamuseal function, must preserve'. When writing this dissertation, when trying to figure out just what practices and changes in the museum field I should be paying attention to, I have found the mental image of the museum of a museum helpful. When I imagined putting the practices under the spotlight and considered how best to explain them in terms of both objects and words, as isolated, examined entities and existing within a specific context, the ordering of museum history became more manageable and easier to visualise.

Many institutions, museums included, form their own research field around their practice (von Unge 2019, 24). At the beginning of the 20th century, 'museum science' was concerned with acquiring, preserving and classifying objects, but when the international ideology known as the 'new museology' emerged during the 1980s and 1990s, the actual handling of the objects was no longer the point of focus; rather, focus shifted to the critical study of how this practice had come to be (von Unge 2019, 25). As Gradén and O'Dell argue, the 1990s was a time when scholarly attitudes were changing and more critical perspectives on heritage display were developed. Scholars began to question the way heritage professionals were 'compartmentalizing' items of culture and heritage into seemingly simple categories, and they rejected such labels as national and regional as self-evident or natural. Instead, they sought 'to understand how such categories become constructed and then reflected in ethnographic disciplines and museum institutions' (Gradén & O'Dell 2018a, 317). As Gradén and O'Dell put it, scholars came to see 'museums not just as holders or transmitters of culture, but as products of culture'. Within this tradition, they approached and analysed the concept of heritage, and the tradition of institutional heritage making in particular, as a 'cultural practice about cultural practices' (Gradén & O'Dell 2018a, 312).

Museum practice has the power to transform culture into 'future heritage and history' (Gradén 2019), but how this is done *in practice* is surprisingly difficult to describe in detail. Within the field of museum studies, scholars have discussed the best definition for the museum profession, the best work practices and the change in the job description, but the focus has often been on management or professional development within the museum field (e.g. Krogh Jensen 2019; Korn 2018; Tlili 2015; Ahmas 2014; Tran & King 2009). In Conal McCarthy's (2016, 25) view, there has been plenty of academic research 'on what museum professionals do', but it has been mostly concerned with academic theory rather than everyday practices. There are also examples of studies where museums and their practices have been the object of ethnographic studies, such as Sharon MacDonald's *Behind the Scenes at the Science Museum* (2002).

Andrea Witcomb wrote in 2003 that by using a case study approach to analyse debates in the museum field, she is adding to the 'growing number of accounts of contemporary museum practices' and contributing to 'attempts to document contemporary practices and develop a more complex sense of the history of museums' (Witcomb 2003, 8). In the early 1990s, such accounts were still rare, and according to her, there was no 'tradition that encouraged curators and other museum staff to critically analyse their practice and communicate such analysis in the wider public sphere' (2003, 8). By the early 2000s, this subfield had already emerged, with several scholars writing about museums not just from theorical positions 'but also from practical experience' (Witcomb 2003, 8). One such example, and crucial to the study at hand, is Eilean Hooper-Greenhill's book *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge* (1992), in which she attempts to make the history of museums more complex, asking:

> What does 'knowing' in museums mean? What counts as knowledge in the museum? - - What is acceptable and what is regarded as ridiculous, and why? Does this change over time? How are individual people expected to perform in museums? - - What is the relationship of space, time, subject, and object? And, perhaps the question that subsumes all the others, how are 'museums' constructed as objects? Or, what counts as a museum? (Hooper-Greenhill 1992, 3)

The genre of studying museum practices — the everyday work and events and displays at museums and galleries — is growing (McCarthy 2016, 26). Observing museums from such a perspective can broaden the discussions and interpretations of museums from 'critiques of museums as power houses of social inequality or engines of public good' and from a focus on 'Foucauldian theories of discourse, representation and power/knowledge', which, in McCarthy's view, restrict academic analysis by focusing too much on the dichotomy 'of good/bad ideas at the expense of what people do, in other words of social practice' (McCarthy 2016, 24; *cf.* Hooper-Greenhill 1992).

FINNISH MUSEUM HISTORY AS A TOPIC OF RESEARCH

Especially since museology became established as an academic discipline in Finland in the 1980s, the field of research related to Finnish museums, their functions and history has grown. As a multidisciplinary field, museums interest people from varying academic backgrounds and perspectives, such as history, archaeology, art history, ethnology, conservation studies and various applied sciences. Broadly categorised, in doctoral dissertations related to museum studies Finnish researchers have addressed topics such as the meaning-making process that takes place as part of collecting, musealisation and exhibiting (Sjöberg-Pietarinen 2004; Valtonen 2006; Salminen 2011; Potinkara 2015), conservation and collection management (Kecskeméti 2008; Knuutinen 2009; Robbins 2016), museum education (Hänninen 2006; Venäläinen 2019), museums' role in the formation of cultural heritage (Lonkila 2016), museums' potential in the field of digital heritage (Häyrinen 2012; Laine-Zamojska 2017) and museum visitors' experiences and expectations (Hannula 2019).[2]

The study of the history and ideology of museums is a recognised field within museum studies (e.g. Bennett 1995; Maleuvre 1999; Witcomb 2003; Genoways & Andrei 2008). The history of Finnish museums and the museum field has also fascinated many a researcher. The online database of the Finnish Museums Association, which lists written sources and publications covering the history of Finnish museums, includes 570 items, mostly dating from the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s (Finnish Museums Association 2005). According to Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen, while several bachelor's theses done in Finland in the 1960s focused on museums in an historical context, museum history as a research field only became more established in the 1980s (Pettersson & Kinanen 2010a, 11). At that time, the topic of interest was mostly collection histories of particular museums, but in the following decades the studies became more multifaceted (Pettersson & Kinanen 2010a, 11). Several doctoral dissertations have also dealt with museum history from different

[2] This is not a complete list of Finnish doctoral dissertations related to museological topics.

perspectives: a single individual's legacy and impact on the museum field (Kava 1993; Selkokari 2008), the effect of museum architecture (Rönkkö 1999) and the early phases of art collecting (Pettersson 2008).

According to Pettersson and Kinanen, despite widespread interest in the theme, a comprehensive presentation of Finnish museum history, one that would recount the birth and development of Finnish museums and discuss museum collections and museum profession from the 18th century to the 21st century, had been in the making for more than 30 years (Huovinen 2010, 7; Pettersson & Kinanen 2010a, 11). This task was finally realised in 2010, with the publication of *Suomen museohistoria* — in English *Finnish Museum History* (Pettersson & Kinanen 2010b). In her review of the book, ethnologist Hanneleena Hieta (2012, 138) points out that the committee for the Finnish Museum History Project, which was responsible for the publication, consisted of 'the most notable names in the museum field', and the writers for the book 'were chosen from the ranks of "the best experts in the museum field and long-term professionals"' (Hieta 2012, 139). Hieta believes this was meant to make an impression on the reader: 'not only is [the book] a fruit of meticulous labour, but also the truth about the Finnish museum history the way the establishment sees it' (Hieta 2012, 139). However, Hieta claims that the book does not always present the whole story. For example, the book seems to emphasize the connections to and similarities with the Swedish museum field, even though many individuals working in Finnish museums also had networks elsewhere in Europe and the United States (Hieta 2012, 139).

The book *Finnish Museum History* covers, for example, the development of formal structures and hierarchies in the museum field (Vilkuna 2010a; Härö 2010; Heinonen 2010), the role of the Finnish Museums Association (Kinanen 2010), a summarised history of museum education (Levanto 2010) and conservation (Reijonen 2010), the role of museum architecture (Rönkkö 2010), collecting and collection histories (Kostet 2010), and the story of how museology became an academic discipline (Vilkuna 2010b). It also includes articles that deal with the changing museum profession (Kinanen 2010; Levanto 2010; Palviainen 2010). In another review of the book, Kalle Kallio (2010, 102) notes that the anthology hardly deals with any internal contradictions in the field, although through such negotiations one could well describe a change in museum thinking. For example, Pauliina Kinanen's article about the development of computer-based cataloguing in museums fails to mention how the lack of coordination and the reluctant views of crucial institutions that the museum industry would never shift to electronic collection management led to the adoption of 30 different databases among Finnish museums (Kallio 2010, 102).

As Hieta remarks, a 'human voice' is heard in only a few articles in the book: where either the author assumes the first person singular or where the topic and methods are clearly folkloristic, like in Mari Hatakka's article about museum visitors' museum memories (Hieta 2012, 139; Hatakka 2010). In Kallio's (2010, 101–102) opinion, the book gets stuck listing the history of events, and whereas reports, appointments and grants are recorded, the ideas and practices that affected the museums' activities remain obscure. Thus, the book is a valuable source of information for historical research, but it lacks an ethnological perspective.

As cultural institutions, museums act on an institutional level, through guidelines and informal regulations, but they are also created at the everyday level, where the material environment, social interactions, informal rules and standards all play an important role (Björklund & Silow Kallenberg 2019, 5). According to Maria Björklund and Kim Silow Kallenberg, ethnologists who apply ethnographic methods are best suited to assess institutions at the everyday level and study how overall societal ideals and norms take place and shape everyday life for people in different contexts (Björklund & Silow Kallenberg 2019, 5–6). This is how I, as an ethnologist, intend to contribute to the studies on recent Finnish museum history.

THE CHANGING MUSEUM FIELD OF THE LATE TWENTIETH CENTURY

As Patrick J. Boylan (2006, 415) points out, 'a small number of the world's museums have existed for many hundreds of years', but 'the great majority are very recent creations in historical terms'. In the so-called developing countries, very few museums existed in the colonial period, but also in the more developed countries most museums have only been established since the end of the Second World War (Boylan 2006, 415). In Finland, the more recent history of the museum field has thus far received less attention in literature than its early years.[3] Until recently, this era has been viewed as too 'close' to the present for more in-depth historical examination, but now, well into the twenty-first century, perspectives have changed.

The changes that took place in the Finnish museum field from the 1960s onwards have been acknowledged in numerous instances, but a comprehensive history of this time period has yet to be written. In 2016, the Finnish Heritage Agency (FHA) published the first part of a book series recounting the story of the institution. The first part deals with the history of the then *Archaeological Commission* (Muinaismuistotieteellinen toimikunta) until year 1971, after which it was restructured as the FHA[4] (Immonen 2016), while the second part recounts the 100-year history of the National Museum of Finland (Talvio 2016), but a third part, covering the years of the FHA between 1972 and 2015, is still forthcoming. In 2019, the Union of Academic Museum Employees (MAL ry) celebrated its 50th anniversary and had its history written by Uula Neitola (2019), and even though the different turns in the organisation's history also reflect the changes in the field of museum work, the perspective of the book is more on the museum as such and labour politics than on everyday working life in the museums.

Kirsi Hänninen (2006, 47) suggests that throughout its history, the international museum field has gone through at least three democratising

[3] There are some exceptions, such as Hanneleena Hieta's (2010) dissertation, in which she uses several case studies to examine how the museum institution adapted to changing societal and cultural environments between 1970 and 2000.

[4] Known in English at the time as the National Board of Antiquities (NBA).

waves that have made it more accessible to society and brought it closer to museum audiences and communities — but that have also changed the idea and form of museums.[5] The first wave began in the 18th century when museums — such as the British Museum and the Louvre – first became open to the public (Hänninen 2006, 46–47). However, in the 'museum rhetoric of the Victorian age', museums were still on a mission to civilise the masses, who were regarded as passive: they were the 'people that the museum spoke to, provided the expertise on, and did things to' (Crooke 2015, 483; see also Bennett 1995, 23–24).

The second wave, according to Hänninen, lasted from the 1960s to the 1980s,[6] and it prompted the professionalisation of museum work and involvement of public administration and state subsidiaries and raised questions about the societal representativeness of museums and their exhibitions. The second wave had clear antecedents, though. As Norton-Westbrook has pointed out, the 'large-scale reorientation of the museum's aims toward public service' started already in the post-World War II era, when, for example, ICOM was founded (1945) and public service aims became part of the established museum doctrine (Norton-Westbrook 2015, 346; Hänninen 2006, 46–47).

Museums have always had to adjust to the changes and power plays in society, and museums throughout the world are situated in very different contexts – thus, change is happening all the time, everywhere, and not always at the same time. Still, especially at the end of the 20th century, museum workers might have felt that the changes experienced in the museum field have been extreme, rapid, unexpected and 'unacceptable' (Hooper-Greenhill 1992, 1–2). In the 1970s and 1980s, the n*ew museology* trend gained ground, and debates about the institutional elitism of museums and their overall purpose rose to a new level (Norton-Westbrook 2015, 357). While the discussions on the social relevance of museums and criticisms of their practices of presenting history were not entirely unprecedented (see, e.g. Dana 1917; Maleuvre 1999, 1–5, 13–14; Witcomb 2003, 8), they brought questions about museums'

[5] There are also other ways to perceive the shift in the museum paradigm. For example, Palmyre Pierroux, Per Hetland and Line Esborg (2020, 3) summarise the change in the societal role of museums as a shift from cultivating spectators to engaging audiences, aspects of which have been categorised in museum studies as *social*, *participatory* and *educational* turns.

relationships with their audiences and community involvement to the forefront, replacing the prior discourses emphasising collecting, interpreting and exhibiting (Tatsi 2011, 67; Witcomb 2003, 59).[7] The new ideology also meant that inside the museum, management hierarchy was reduced and museums adopted a project-based approach to exhibitions (Reidla 2018, 118; 2020, 370; see also Hieta 2012, 41–42, 46; McCall & Gray 2014, 19). The third democratising wave, according to Hänninen, was related to the discussions about the accessibility of museums, which began in the 1990s (Hänninen 2006, 47–50; Hieta 2012, 46).[8]

The 'first wave' of museum making in Finland appeared in the 19th nineteenth century, which was an 'era of vigorous national development and the creation of institutions, the formation of collections and collecting practices' (Pettersson 2011, 261). At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries Finnish museums were run by a small group of men with an academic education and nationalist ideals (Palviainen 2010, 321). As Susanna Pettersson recounts, the majority of Finnish museums — including the National Museum of Finland and the National Gallery — were originally established on private initiatives, either of private or semi-public level. Prominent collectors donated 'their lifetime achievements to "the nation"', and semi-public institutional bodies, such as the Finnish Art Society or the Finnish Antiquarian Society, provided an institutional framework for collecting national heritage (Pettersson 2011, 266).

After Finland gained independency in 1917, an ideology promoting local heritage became quite popular, with many new museums devoted to exhibiting the peasant culture of a specific region (Rinta-Porkkunen & Ylitalo 2003, 113). The museums were maintained by volunteers, with the result being that by the 1930s, the so-called 'museum trend' and the lack of professionalism caused resentment among some (Palviainen 2010, 322). The Second World War interrupted normal operations in the museum field as well as elsewhere in society, but the latter half of the twentieth century was a time of 'growth and diverse development of professionalisation' (Vilkuna 2018, 101). Finland created a comprehensive welfare system, with higher education made

[7] The demands to advance the participation of different (marginalised) communities is also tied to discussions of reconciliation and repatriation (see, e. g. Gazi 1990).
[8] These democratisation waves coincided with wider societal discussions and movements, as, for example, Pierroux, Hetland and Esborg remind us (2020, 6–9).

available to more people and an expanded public sector (Palviainen 2010, 324). The great demand for labour in the post-war years meant that many newcomers did not have time to complete a university degree, but also that the Finnish museum field became more heterogeneous (Palviainen 2010, 324).

The post-war period was also a time of industrialisation, urbanisation and nation building, and as Teppo Korhonen (1989, 105–106) has noted, at the time there was a social call for local heritage societies and museums, and many traditional farm buildings were repurposed as local heritage museums (in Fin. *kotiseutumuseo*, in Swe. *hembygdsgård*). As Nina Rinta-Porkkunen and Saija Ylitalo (2003, 114) have remarked, through the work of newly established national and local history societies 'a local museum was founded in almost every municipality'. The local heritage museums have become centres of preserving local heritage and venues for festivities, usually run by volunteers or *amateur museum workers* who often lack any official training (Heinonen 2010, 164–165; Salminen 2011, 94–96; Rinta-Porkkunen & Ylitalo 2003, 112). Nowadays, there are nearly 1000 local heritage museums in Finland, most of which are maintained by municipalities, foundations or societies and supported by the Finnish Local Heritage Federation (The Finnish Local Heritage Federation n.d.). In comparison, professional museum organisations are responsible for a total of 326 museum sites (Pettersson 2011, 264). As Pettersson (2011, 264) points out, the number of museums in Finland 'is one of the highest in Europe' in relation to the overall number of citizens in (ca. 5.5 million).

The Finnish museum field has been following global trends, but especially the second democratising wave has been tied to specifically domestic developments (Hieta 2012, 46). A 1979 government decision resulted in state funding and oversight for all professionally maintained museums, which at the time consisted of a network of regional cultural history museums, regional art museums and museums with specific national responsibilities (Vilkuna 2018, 96–97). Their roles and requirements for receiving state subsidies were later defined by the Museum Act and Decree, enacted in 1989 (Vilkuna 2018, 97). Thus, Finnish museums became publicly funded institutions that had to show correspondingly that they represented the whole face of society (Hieta 2012, 46).

By the 1970s, an increasing number of museums in Finland were professionally run, and the number of staff members had grown (Vilkuna 2018, 101). The need for professional exchanges resulted in the founding of several professional organisations and labour associations (Vilkuna 2018, 101; Palviainen 2010, 324–325). As Janne Vilkuna recounts, the Finnish ICOM committee was established in 1946, the Finnish branch of the Nordic Association of Conservators in 1963, the Union of Academic Museum Employees in 1969, an association for museum directors in 1985 and an association for curators in 1985 (Vilkuna 2018, 101) The last occupational groups in the Finnish museum field to start their own associations were museum educators (2005) and technicians (2012) (Vilkuna 2018, 101).

There is no consensus on whether or not there is a *museum profession*, because the professional field, training, qualifications and job markets have developed very differently in different societies (e.g. Palviainen 2010, 316; see also Boylan 2006, 416–419, 424–429). Still, the training and professional qualifications of workers have been topics of discussion for at least a hundred years: as Norton-Westbrook (2015, 350) has noted, '[A]rguments about the best way to prepare an individual for a curatorial career are nearly as old as the profession itself'. However, as the Finnish museum field became more organised and specialised, the demands for more academic training likewise increased (Neitola 2018, 61). Finnish universities started arranging courses on museum work in the 1960s, but museology first became a minor subject in Finland at the undergraduate level only in 1983 at the University of Jyväskylä (Neitola 2019, 61; Vilkuna 2018, 99; Thomas et al. 2018, 346). Still, university studies in museology only became a requirement for museum work in 2006, following a new Museum Decree, which defined the minimum training requirements for staff members in statutorily subsidised museums (Neitola, 2019, 62; Vilkuna 2018, 100; Thomas et al. 2018, 347). As Vilkuna (2018, 101) points out, 47 per cent of Finnish museum professionals had not studied museology in 2003, whereas by 2013 it was only 36 per cent. Most museum employees also hold an MA degree, meaning that the academic level of museum professionals is high (Vilkuna 2018, 101).[9]

[9] However, in her review of the book *Suomen museohistoria*, Hieta points out that less than half of the seventeen contributors to the book held doctoral degrees, which in her opinion is also indicative of the academic level of the Finnish museum field (Hieta 2012, 140).

The relationship between the new museology and museum practice(s) has received increasing scholarly attention recently. In general, the new museology has ‘focused less on the administrative processes and professional practices found in museums, and more on the place of museums in society’ (Jones 2021, 8). Therefore, as Reidla claims, the ‘impact of new museology on in-house working relations has remained largely unstudied’ (Reidla 2020, 368). According to Elżbieta Nieroba, the impact has in fact not been as significant as is suggested in museological literature, and ‘everyday museology combines elements of the “old” and “new” philosophies’ (Nieroba 2018, 1). Scholars have largely accepted that the new museology has affected the way museums have reinvented their place and functions in society, but I would suggest that the ways it has affected the forms and meanings of ‘in-house’ museum work deserves more attention.

On the other hand, other outside factors have affected the museum practices as well, which may well have been overlooked. Whether publicly or privately funded, museums are affected by the economy, and the democratisation processes of the last few decades have also been mixed up with outward economic pressures. Ideas about new public management have permeated the cultural sector in the last few decades and reduced governmental support has made it necessary for museums to think more in terms of efficiency and accountability when planning their activities (Ekström 2020, 2–3). As Legget (2017, 8) points out, museums nowadays ‘can no longer rely on governments to consider them a “public good”, worthy of support in their own right because of their intrinsic value’. Therefore, museums have had to adopt more market-oriented ideologies and practices, and their mission statements now frequently use catchphrases such as ‘creative industry’, ‘community participation’ and ‘service delivery’, phrases previously foreign to them (Legget 2017, 8; see also Ekström 2020, 1).

As Ekström (2020, 2) claims, the influences of the market economy and demand for marketing skills, public relations and fund raising among cultural institutions has run parallel to ‘greater expectations from politicians to make cultural venues more accessible’ and have a stronger societal impact. Participation and community involvement have become hallmarks of quality in museum practice, and discussions about the significance of museums in the world have also become a tool for defining their legitimacy when their financial resources are being scrutinised (Pierroux, Hetland, & Esborg 2020, 3; Brenna 2016, 36; Robbins 2020, 57). Competing in the experience economy has forced the curator's role to become more market oriented and led to an identity crisis in the museum field, and at times it might seem that museums have become theatrical showrooms always trying to attract larger audiences, leaving the collections fading in the background (Gradén & O'Dell 2018b, 450; Gradén & O'Dell 2018c, 57–58; Ekström 2020, 7). Gradén and O'Dell (2016, 64) have noted that though neoliberalism may be 'worth demonising', it is also time 'to analyse seriously how cultural and economic processes are entangled in the world of museums in different national and social contexts'.

Museums have also been affected by the technological turn of society. As Erik Tirkkonen, amanuensis of the Finnish Maritime Museum, states in an interview on the history of the Union of Academic Museum Employees, digitality is 'being crammed' also into museum work, and the development of technology is the clearest change that has occurred during his career (Neitola 2019, 113). For some time now, information technology has been part of most museum professionals' daily operations (Marty 2006, 319). Indeed, according to Manuel Castells, a sociologist and researcher of information society, 'a new technological paradigm organised around information technologies' took place in the last decades of the twentieth century (Castells 2010, 28). In the museum field, computers and information technology have paved the way to collection management systems that 'enabled museums to rapidly access and share data about objects' and have 'ushered in the era of interactive computer-based learning' (Angus 2012, 40). Digital applications have also allowed museums to reach broader socially and geographically disparate audiences and colleagues working in museums on the other side of the world: 'Email, instant messaging, chat, and wikis, to name only a few applications, allow unprecedented knowledge-sharing and collaboration' and have 'revolutionized how we perform our jobs and live our lives' (Angus 2012, 41). Digital working practices proved to be invaluable during the COVID-19 pandemic, when museums were forced to close their facilities. They were still able to offer access to cultural heritage and maintain a relationship with their audiences through online collection portals, social media accounts, virtual exhibitions and tours, curatorial talks and other educational material provided online (Zuanni 2020; see also Bull 2020).

Still, the themes of information technology and developing digital skills or tools are rarely discussed as part of museum history. As Ross Parry has also pointed out, the history and story of museum computing has not been given the same academic scrutiny as the rest 'of our curatorial and museographical past' (Parry 2007, 6–8; see also Ekosaari 2008, 1–2). One reason might be that the process is still seen as an open-ended one that is not yet finished. Another explanation is that dealing with information technology — similar to marketing — is not understood as 'museal' work, even though it has clearly changed the everyday work done in museums (Parry 2007, 2; Article III).

ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

The Finnish Museum History Project coincided with a demand to identify the authorship and agency of different individuals working in museums. In 2014, in a *Museum Worlds* editorial, Kylie Message and Sarah Dudley wrote: 'One thing that has often remained missing from the public record, however, and hence from metanarratives about how museums make meaning, is the particular agencies of museum — particularly curatorial — staff' (Message & Dudley 2014, 2). This has led to a process of anthropomorphising the museum 'so that it comes to stand in for the work of individuals' (Message & Dudley 2014, 2). Portraying a museum as a homogenising entity, speaking with a single voice, has political connotations, especially in the case of national museums. As part of a discussion about museums as open public spheres, Message and Dudley ask: 'how can we expect exhibitions to function as public spheres or as contact zones – – when we don't see the dialogue and debate, let alone the people, that have lobbied, fought, and worked so hard to make them?' (Message & Dudley 2014, 2).

In their editorial — or 'call for action', as they put it — Message and Dudley proposed a series on 'Key Curators' as a way to build a public record 'about changing museum practice and the analysis and debate that has surrounded, engaged with, or taken issue with the museums, collections, and exhibitions and the concepts of public history that result as the physical manifestations of this curatorship' (Message & Dudley 2014, 3). They also refer to Stephen Gilchrist's argument about curatorial practice being a form of cultural heritage 'that should be documented and recorded' (Gilchrist 2014, as cited in Message & Dudley 2014, 3).

The problem with writing a history of the museum field is that one can easily present a museum as a single entity, as Message and Dudley (2014) point out, or focus too much on a single person's biography. Focusing on individual biographies can be justifiable when studying the early years of the public museum movement, when the museum field, including in Finland, was more dependent on a small group of charismatic figures (Hill 2012, 3). However, when uncritical, this type of narration also easily denies the agency of others working in the museum field (Hill 2012, 3).

According to Kate Hill, previous versions of museum history told an 'uncomplicated story of institutional progress — often identified with a particular, charismatic curator, or a series of them' (Hill 2012, 2). In Anne Whitelaw's words, these 'linear accounts of progress and accomplishment' typically focused 'on a select figure in the institution's history whose foresight, collecting acumen, or philanthropic generosity made a significant contribution to the institution's fortunes' (Whitelaw 2012, 76). Whitelaw points out that especially the role of women in maintaining museums and art galleries is quite often overlooked, while on the other hand a biographical approach often valorises women who have occupied positions of power, for example as directors and curators, and thus 'ignores the anonymous labour of predominantly female voluntary groups that have made the museum's existence possible' (Whitelaw 2012, 76). Celebrating the accomplishments of women in museum history is an important statement, but 'it risks participating in a discourse of exceptionalism where only the very few are acknowledged' (Whitelaw 2012, 83).

The biographical genre includes a risk of emphasising single exceptional figures and linear chronologies and isolating others from the institutional structures and histories (Whitelaw 2012, 76). The emphasis on exceptional individuals and their successes and struggles neglects the inner workings of the museum as an institution, institutional discourses that affect individual practices and the dynamic social relationships of the staff (Whitelaw 2012, 84). In Whitelaw's opinion, the director or curator of a museum should be seen 'as a product of both individual agency and as shaped by the ideological and aesthetic beliefs of the institution itself' (Whitelaw 2012, 84). Instead of privileging individual agency, research on museum history should demonstrate how people have become 'entangled in a variety of discourses and fields of action' (Sandino 2012, 88).

Museums are — and always have been — surrounded by a range of stakeholders, such as governments, funders, donors, staff, auction houses, media, visitors and consumers, all of whom may want to have a say in just what museums are and how they should operate (e.g. Ekström 2020, 3, 7). This dissertation mostly represents the viewpoints of museum professionals — people employed by a museum — but Article II also includes voices from the field of amateur-based local heritage museums. The imbalance in the representation of different perspectives is mostly due to the nature of the empirical material. However, the decision to also include the questionnaire responses of the non-professionals is in line with the overall objective of this study: to examine museums as social worlds and cultural concepts. Despite the emphasis on the voice of museum professionals, I want to stress that the discussion on just *what a museum is* is not owned only by *museum professionals* — a notion that is also debatable since the museum world has always included people without a professional affiliation.

WORK AND CULTURE

Finnish ethnologists have done a great deal of research related to work and working communities. In the early years of the discipline, the focus lay on agrarian work, but since the 1950s there has been a growing interest in the working class and industrial working communities (Snellman 2018, 94–97; Vanha-Similä 2017, 22–26). The University of Turku and Professor Ilmar Talve led the way in this research field, and the approach was rather similar to previous studies on agrarian communities (Snellman 2018, 95–97).[10] As

[10] As Hanna Snellman notes, despite an interest in the working class, the 'School of Talve' strived to be unpolitical and objective in its documenting and avoided such topics as the labour movement, the

Hanna Snellman (2018, 96–97) points out, the second generation of labour studies researchers, who took the stage in the 1980s and 1990s, was more inspired by *Oral History* and the Swedish school of *Cultural Analysis* than by the outcomes of the so-called 'School of Talve'. In recent doctoral dissertations, ethnologists have focused on, for example, university-educated foresters (Paaskoski 2008), harbour workers (Steel 2013), border guards (Tiili 2016), communities of factory workers (Vanha-Similä 2017) and rural shopkeepers (Kurkinen 2020). Besides specific professional groups, ethnologists have also been interested in more cross-cutting themes, such as unemployment (Steel & Tuori 2019) and labour migration (Telve 2016).

In Finnish ethnological studies, the world of an academically educated labour force has not been a frequent topic — with some exceptions, such as Leena Paaskoski's dissertation — whereas in Sweden the 'white-collar' workforce and the technical and economic changes that have affected their professional skills and identity have been the focus of several studies (see, e.g. Ehn 2001; Lundgren 2002; Björklund & Silow Kallenberg 2019). Swedish ethnologists have adopted such a perspective to study, for example, the health care and educational sectors as well as museums (Björklund & Silow Kallenberg 2019, 6–7). Maria Björklund and Kim Silow Kallenberg (2019, 2) have even suggested establishing *institutionsetnologi* (institutional ethnology) as its own specialised subfield within ethnology,[11] as ethnologists are best suited to studying the everyday level of institutional life and its material environment, social interactions, informal rules and norms (Björklund & Silow Kallenberg 2019, 2). According to Björklund and Silow Kallenberg, institutions are great empirical fields for ethnologists interested in culturally dominant norms, values and ideals as well as cultural change (Björklund & Silow Kallenberg 2019, 8).

One important aspect of museum practice and museum work is their materiality. Orvar Löfgren (2012, 177) has noted that ethnological dissertations done in the 1950s and 1960s often focused on studying work as part of *material culture*. The topics included agricultural implements, fishing methods, textile skills and artisan traditions (Löfgren 2012, 177). While there

Finnish Civil War, ideology or social class. Ethnologist were also absent from the Finnish Labour Heritage Association network until the 1990s (Snellman 2018, 94–95, 99).

[11] Since the word *ethnography* can refer to both ethnographic methods and representations, analyses of contemporary or past institutions that are based on written material could also be described as institutional ethnography (Björklund & Silow Kallenberg 2019, 8).

is still interest in traditional craftmanship and skills among ethnologists (e.g. Rauhala 2019), less attention has been paid to working skills and the handling of different material elements 'in contemporary urban work settings' (Löfgren 2012, 177). Löfgren points out that even though there have been a few attempts to capture the materiality of a workplace, the field of museum studies has distinguished itself as an exception: 'The skills and everyday problems of collecting, selecting, sorting, maintaining, and exhibiting is a rich subgenre in the field' (Löfgren 2012, 178). Still, I would argue that the field of museum studies mostly focuses on the use and affects of objects in museum collections, and not so much on the material elements of a museum as a workplace. Christina Kreps suggests that we should understand curatorial work as a social practice and an 'interplay of objects, people, and societies', and while curators should be more mindful of the meanings that museum objects have to the cultural groups from which they originated, we should also be more mindful of the meanings they have in the social world of the people who work in a museum (Kreps 2003, 213).

Ethnologists who study work, working communities and professionals at work are usually interested in themes that are not conveyed in the formal sources: in the tacit knowledge and expertise that is difficult to transfer into writing, the shared logic and practices, shared values and what is considered culturally self-evident within the group in question (e.g. Tiili 2016, 16–18). These aspects are sometimes summed up as *professional culture* (e.g. Paaskoski 2008). As Miia-Leena Tiili (2016, 17–18) points out, the concept of professional culture can be misleading. The term *culture* is in itself ambiguous and might imply a static structure that is clearly defined or a close community that is experienced in the same way by all of its members (Tiili 2016, 18; Paaskoski 2008, 11). Miia-Leena Tiili is of the opinion that the concept of *culture* is particularly difficult when studying a poly-professional working community consisting of people with very heterogeneous training (Tiili 2016, 17–18).[12] In Tiili's words, the research topic — or culture — should not be seen as a monolithic entity that can be captured and classified (Tiili 2016, 18). It should be understood that culture is constructed in the interactions within communities and that individuals always have subjective interpretations of it (Tiili 2016, 18; Paaskoski 2008, 11).

[12] One might of course ask if working communities are ever really homogeneous.

However, it is useful to have some concept that depicts the network of shared values, practices and understandings in a workplace or a community. Arguably, many workplaces form communities with unwritten rules about 'how things are done' based on previous shared experiences and coping strategies that can only be learned through informal socialisation (e.g. Jung 2016, 160; see also Hirvi & Snellman 2012, 8; Snellman 2003, 46). Julia Harrison also claims that organisations such as museums have their own unique identity and character that is expressed in institutional norms, values and practices — 'something which in anthropological terms could be glossed under the notion of cultural traditions, practices, or simply a way of being in the world' (Harrison 2005, 197). I believe that use of the concept 'culture' — either as organisational or institutional — is justifiable in this context so long as its meaning and connotations are made clear.[13] For example, Harrison uses the concept of institutional culture in her study of collaborative relationships established between museums and their 'source communities', but she stresses that it should be understood as in the studies of anthropology: 'culture is something organic, fragmented, ambiguous, if not contradictory' (Harrison 2005, 198).

Geert Hofstede claims that organisational cultures are holistic, historically influenced, related to anthropological concepts, socially constructed, soft and relatively stable, that is, difficult to change (Hofstede 2001, 393; see also Jung 2016, 160). Julia Harrison also points out that while institutional or organisational culture should be perceived as dynamic — as opposed to being static and monolithic — such cultural forms cannot be 'revolutionized over a short-time period' via organisational restructuring or changing management styles (Harrison 2005, 198). Any fundamental change to the shared culture is more likely to be 'incremental, implicitly consensual, and sporadic' and take place very slowly (Harrison 2005, 198). In Harrison's opinion, this should be especially true in the case of museums and other institutions, where the employees are engaged in documenting and preserving history and perhaps value past knowledge as 'something that might positively influence what might be' (Harrison 2005, 198). Her point is that 'museum cultures can be expected to maintain a recognizable coherency through time,

[13] The concept of culture can denote different meanings in different disciplines, and literature related to business and management might define organisational or institutional culture differently.

despite personnel changes and organizational restructuring' (Harrison 2005, 198).

WHO ARE MUSEUM PROFESSIONALS?

> The 'museums profession' is a generous idea and one with which a significant proportion of people in museum employment are willing to identify. The notion of a museums profession suggests cohesion, concerns and skills held in common, and sets of norms and values recognizable by all. The profession is accepted largely without question by those who see themselves as part of it and as a result has not attracted a great deal of research interest. It represents as much an ideal as a reality and is therefore dealt with uncritically. (Kavanagh 1991, 39)

Institutional or organisational cultures still differ somewhat from *professional culture*. While not homogeneous, institutions of different sizes are workplaces where people are in fairly close interaction with and share their everyday lives with one another, whereas *professional culture* refers to a more abstract community that covers everybody working in the same field or occupation. It should be noted that several different occupational or professional subcultures can take place under the roof of a single institution, but they can also cross institutional borders (Hollifield, Kosicki, & Becker 2001, 94). Institutional and professional cultures might at times collide with each other, but they do not have to be exclusive. Individuals can construct their identities in relation to many factors, including several close, virtual, imagined and abstract communities. However, if institutional cultures are 'organic, fragmented, ambiguous, if not contradictory' (Harrison 2005, 198), then professional cultures are possibly even more so.

With all this being said, the museological literature about museum professionals and their collective identity or professionalism in the museum field in general requires some reflection. Indeed, use of the word pair *museum professional* carries with it strong connotations. By many definitions, being *professional* conveys an idea of specialised skills and knowledge that require training and working experience, acceptance of high ethical standards related to the field of work and a certain societal status tied with economic and political power and authority (Palviainen 2010, 316; Boylan 2006, 424). Being a professional is associated with a certain amount of authority, and therefore, being a *professional* in one's occupational field is a valuable position.

Traditionally, museum work has been associated with the curator: 'an academic specializing in a specific collection-related field who can perform all tasks necessary to the museum' (Kavanagh 1994, 7).[14] These 'scholar-curators' emerged as the first professionals in the museum field in the 18th and 19th centuries as connoisseurs and specialists in their chosen academic field, and they undertook all the museum's specialised work related to acquiring, documenting and researching collections (Reidla 2018, 115; Boylan 2006, 418). Their work was supported by 'non-professional' staff responsible for security, cleaning and secretarial assistance (Boylan 2006, 418.).

So long as museums concentrated on preserving and supplementing their collections, the curators' role was central. But, beginning around the 1980s, their position started to be influenced by the ideas of new museology, according to which 'museums are supposed to turn their focus from collections-centredness to society-centredness' (Reidla 2018, 116, 118). Such ideas led museums to revise their activities, collections and exhibition policies, and ultimately, the job descriptions of their staff (Reidla 2020, 358; Norton-Westbrook 2015, 341). As Christine Kreps (2003, 312) puts it, 'curatorial work has become so encompassing that it is now difficult to define precisely what a curator is and does'.

The ideological shift and the new emphasis on the importance of communication was followed by changes in the organisational structure of museums (Reidla 2020, 369). So-called traditional museums tended to be collections-based spaces and divided into sub-units according to different disciplines, and a curator's responsibilities varied from research to educational work. Based on the new structure, where emphasis is placed on communication, museums were divided into different function-based units with a range of specialists carrying out the tasks of communication, marketing and other services, and the department in charge of producing exhibitions was subordinated to the museum services department (Reidla 2018, 118; 2020, 369-372; see also Macdonald 2002). This structural change is still taking

[14] However, as Jana Reidla has pointed out, even the curators' responsibilities and practices vary in the museum field, depending on their institutional and local contexts (Reidla 2018, 115, 118; see also Kreps 2003, 311–312).

place, and, for example, the National Museum of Finland 'converted' to the newer structural model in 2015 (Reidla 2020, 372). Adopting the newer model 'shows the museums' conscious wishes to become, according to the ideas of the new museology, more visitor-centred and open' (Reidla 2020, 372). The shift could even be considered part of the latest democratisation wave (cf. Hänninen 2006). However, the curators' role in producing exhibitions has consequently become marginalised (Reidla 2020, 372).

The idea that curatorship is 'the heart of museum work' (Kavanagh 1994, 7) has remained popular, but the narrow definition of museum professionals as curators is by now outdated (Boylan 2006, 419). The roles and functions of museums have become more complex, a 'new managerial museum culture' has emerged, and there is need for a range of complementary and supplementary skills (Kavanagh 1994, 7; Boylan 2006, 420). In Gaynor Kavanagh's words, 'an integrated museums profession has developed', and it can refer to 'curators, education officers, conservators, exhibition technicians, designers, registrars, gallery assistants and attendants, outreach workers, audience advocates, writers, marketing specialists, security experts and managers', all working together in teams (Kavanagh 1994, 7). Miia-Leena Tiili points out that the border officers she has studied as part of her doctoral dissertation in ethnology are not united by a single profession or a task, but rather by an employer and workplace where they carry out their professional operations (Tiili 2016, 17). The situation in museums is rather similar: the titles, job descriptions and work tasks vary greatly, but they are all united by the institution where they work — a museum (Robbins 2020, 61).

One could also argue that in fact, there are several museum professions. This is the view of the ICOM: 'There is not one profession, but several museal professions, that is to say a range of activities attached to the museum, paid or unpaid, by which one can identify a person (in particular for this civil status) and place him in a social category' (Desvallées & Mairesse 2010, 67). Thus, the ICOM 'both recognizes the existence of many professions within museum and acknowledges that not all occupational roles within the museum world are recognized as professions' (Desvallées & Mairesse 2010, 68; see also Tlili 2015, 1101). As Anwar Tlili points out, the notion of professionalism expressed by the ICOM is premised on a 'functional understanding' of museum professionalism: instead of 'emphasising intrinsic professional traits and projecting a sense of homogeneity across the occupational field in question, the ICOM recognises the sociological dimension of the professional status' (Tlili 2015, 1109). Tlili also criticises the way in which museum professionals are defined in a broad-based and unproblematic manner and emphasises the importance of professional knowledge that is particularly 'museal' (Tlili 2015, 1109). He believes that the linchpin of museum work still lies in the museum collections (Tlili 2015, 1110).

As Gaynor Kavanagh (1994, 8) notes, many people in the museum field have held positions at a senior level without having any formal qualifications, which 'points not to a profession, but a (very) loosely held together occupational group'. Yet, in her opinion, 'there is a substantial number of people within the museum workforce who collectively and often consciously express the key characteristics of being a profession' (Kavanagh 1994, 8). The characteristics include having a high degree of specialist and general knowledge about specific subjects, collections and methods, but also 'about museums and their various functions and roles', a 'considerable personal commitment to the ideals of museum provision', a strong sense of public duty, 'a willingness to control the standards of behavior and performance, for example through codes of professional conduct', and being guided by 'peer group control and collective responsibility', which 'seeks to guard standards and encourage improvements in all aspects of museum work' (Kavanagh 1994, 8). By this account, what matters most is the individual's commitment to the professional field and to museums as public institutions.

In summary, being a museum professional could either be defined by the individuals' skills and experience in relation to museums, by their personal commitment to the ideals of museums, by their workplace, including anyone who works in the museum field, or by the fact they engage in tasks that are somehow 'museal'. Defining museum professionals as curators understates the roles of others working in museums. In Kavanagh's opinion, a more inclusive notion of just who is a museum professional is useful in motivating employees to engage in professional and personal development within the museum system, and it should perhaps include even a wider range of museum workers (Kavanagh 1994, 7). Calling someone a museum professional effectively means taking a stance. In this study, the term museum professional refers to people whose occupation is related to the museum or heritage field, regardless of their education or job title or the size or status of their institution.

3. ON THE FIELD, IN THE ARCHIVES

THE FINNISH MUSEUM HISTORY PROJECT

The principal components of my research material consist of questionnaire and interview material produced as part of the Finnish Museum History Project between 2005 and 2011. Its main goal was to produce data for the publication of a concise history of the Finnish museum field (Pettersson 2006, 3). Susanna Pettersson from the Finnish National Gallery (FNG) acted as project manager, and Anja-Tuulikki Huovinen from the Finnish Museums Association (FMA) chaired the board, which included representatives from the FMA, the FHA, the FNH, the Finnish Museum of Natural History, and the discipline of museology at the Universities of Helsinki, Jyväskylä and Turku (Huovinen 2010, 7).

According to Pettersson (2006, 3), making museum history visible would help articulate the importance of museums as agents in cultural policy making, answer the question of why museums exist and for whom, and respond to the contemporary need to analyse the backgrounds of museums from a national perspective. The work began with compiling an inventory of the existing articles, publications and other material concerning the histories of various museums (Pettersson 2006, 3; Huovinen 2010, 7). The material is listed in the database kept by the FMA (Finnish Museums Association 2005).

The next step was to 'collect' the tacit knowledge that is scattered throughout the field (Pettersson 2006, 3). Thus, Finnish museums were encouraged to collect oral histories from their own employees via a series of interviews. The steering group for the oral history project was chaired in turns by Ulla Vihanta (from FNG) and Paula Purhonen (from FHA). Juha Ilvas (from FNG) was responsible for managing the oral history material (Huovinen 2010, 7). Susanna Pettersson and Erkki Anttonen (both from FNG) drafted a template for doing the interviews as well as a form of consent to be signed by the interviewees (Appendix 1 and 2). The goal of the oral history project was to ‘record’ the development of the museum profession with ‘as versatile a sampling as possible’ — both geographically and professionally (Pettersson 2006, 3).

As part of the oral history project, the organisers held a seminar on the 23rd of November 2006, with the title *Museoiden muistitietopäivät* (Museums’ Oral History Days) and published a booklet under the same title, which introduced the goals of the project. It also included articles from pilot museums where some interviews had already been conducted, the interview template and other general advice for the interviewers (Pettersson 2006).

In 2010, the project’s main task was completed, and the concise history of the Finnish museum field was published (Pettersson & Kinanen 2010b). Since *Suomen museohistoria* is the main outcome of the Finnish Museum History Project, it serves as an important context for the interview material analysed in the present study. As discussed in Chapter 2, *Suomen museohistoria* reflects the way the museum institution wants to present itself, but it always reveals much about the priorities and motives of the project planning committee.

ARCHIVAL MATERIAL

MY MUSEUM MEMORIES

As part of the Museum History Project, a questionnaire survey entitled ‘My Museum Memories’[15] was carried out in the years 2007–2008 in collaboration with the Finnish Literature Society’s (FLS) archival experts and resources. It was targeted at a wider audience, distributed to the archive’s regular respondent network and published online (For an overview of the history of FLS’s archives and the tradition of collecting oral histories in Finland, see, e.g. Harvilahti 2012; Mikkola, Olsson, & Stark 2019). The resulting material consists of 496 pages written by 40 respondents: 27 women and 13 men. Of those who provided a birth year, two had been born between 1910 and 1919,

[15] In Finnish: Minun museomuistoni; full archival code: SKS KRA. Museo. KRAK. In this study, the archival unit will be referred to as Museo.

eight between 1920 and 1929, eight between 1930 and 1939, nine between 1940 and 1949, three between 1950 and 1959, one between 1970 and 1979 and one between 1980 and 1989.

The questions in the questionnaire were thematic and open-ended, and the respondents were asked, for example, what their first museum visit was like, where their 'spark' for museums originated and what kinds of exhibitions they found interesting or disappointing (Appendix 3). A summary of the material has been published by Mari Hatakka (2010) in *Suomen museohistoria*.

As Hatakka points out, it is not surprising that the respondents who volunteered to answer a questionnaire about museums have a very positive attitude towards the museum field. Thus, the sample represents the views of a particular group of people, and it cannot be generalised at a broader level (Hatakka 2010, 113–114). However, many people outside the group of respondents can certainly understand and relate to the experiences they described (Hatakka 2010, 114). The material conveys what is considered worth remembering (Hatakka 2010, 120). The respondents did not usually problematise the museum concept, but instead included all kinds of cultural and historical attractions in the lists of museums they have visited. Neither do they question the narratives that museums present (Hatakka 2010, 115, 117). The museums that the respondents had visited cover most of Finland and represent museums of different sizes and fields. The most canonised museums, such as the National Museum of Finland and the Finnish National Gallery *Ateneum*, are mentioned in several responses, and the great men of the 1800s and 1900s in arts and literature and their achievements are greatly esteemed as well (Hatakka 2010, 119–120).

As one unexpected outcome, some of the respondents who had themselves been running local heritage museums (in Fin. *kotiseutumuseo*) wanted to share these experiences as well. The questionnaire only treated the respondents as museum visitors, but many wanted to make it known that they value the museum institution so much that they seek opportunities to volunteer and participate more actively in the heritage field (see, e.g. Orr 2006, 194–197).

INTERVIEWS WITH MUSEUM PROFESSIONALS

The second and larger part of the material included in this study contains biographical interviews with museum professionals. The interviews were conducted on a voluntary basis, meaning they were carried out by various interviewees who were also from the museum field, usually from the same institution as the interviewees or otherwise acquainted with them. The 52 interviews have been archived in various organisations in different formats, and they are listed in the project's database (Finnish Museums Association 2005).[16]

For practical reasons, I have listened to and transcribed 36 of the interviews.[17] These include interviews with persons from the FHA, FMA, FNG and Vantaa City Museum. Thus, geographically the interview material selected for this study represents the capital region of Finland and for the most part the larger national museum organisations. The length of the interviews varied from 38 minutes to approximately three hours.[18]

To my knowledge, the interviewers were free to select the people to be interviewed, and the choices they made reflect their understanding of who is a noteworthy actor in the museum field. It could also be regarded as an expression of whose voice matters. Most of the interviewees were curators or other personnel working with museum collections or museum policies, but the group of interviewees also includes guards, archivists and a janitor.

The project coordinators provided a template interview structure that could be modified when needed. One of the points of focus of the interview question sheet was the development of the museum profession, but it also addressed such topics as the interviewee's childhood and education and the

---

[16] Some of the interviews listed in the database were conducted before the Museum History Project. Three of the interviews used in this study were conducted as part of a master's thesis project by Mirka Kiianmies (2012) and have not been included in the database. Maija Ekosaari (2008) has also made use of the same interview template in her study, but the interviews she conducted have not been added to the database either. Thus, the database should not be considered complete.

[17] Sadly, some interview recordings had been damaged or could not be retrieved. Due to the physical distance involved, I was also unable to make use of the interviews located in archives in Tornio, Tervola, Oulu, Kuopio and Pargas.

[18] The original language of the research material is Finnish, and all translations are my own. Hopefully the translations adequately convey the original meaning.

history of the museum and its collections. The biographical interview structure follows the tradition of *oral history*, which became popular amongst Finnish ethnologists in the 1990s (Snellman 2003, 57). Still, in my opinion one should not draw too many conclusions from the family backgrounds or childhood experiences of the museum professionals, which could easily then reinforce a narrative of deterministic inevitability and exceptionalism (cf. Spock 2000).

The question sheet also included questions about changes in the workplace and suggested that one should pay attention to 'amusing stories' by the interviewees regarding their museum career (Appendix 1). Erkki Anttonen and Susanna Pettersson (from FNG) instructed the interviewers to follow the given template loosely but pointed out that it also includes lists of additional topics that might be interesting to discuss. According to them, it would be advisable to design individual questions for each interviewee according to their job description. They also suggest asking the interviewees about the most significant exhibitions that their museum has undertaken during their career, because they represent concrete entry points through which one can discuss general questions related to the museum profession, and moreover they give a 'certain chronological structure' to the interviews (Anttonen & Pettersson 2006, 36).

The interviewees are with members of the 'exiting generation', those who had started their careers in the mid-twentieth century and had either retired or were close to retiring at the time of the interviews. In Finnish museological research, this generation has been termed 'the third generation of museum professionals'. According to Knut Drake, the first generation was active between 1893 and 1930, and it consisted of pioneers in the fields of archaeology, ethnology and art history. For them, museum work meant above all else academic research and documenting a distinct national identity (Drake 1994, 6-8, as cited in Hieta 2012, 41). They were also active in shaping the museum collections and founding national museum institutions (Palviainen 2010, 321–322). The second generation of museum professionals took over in the 1920s (Drake 1994, 6–8, as cited in Hieta 2012, 41; Palviainen 2010, 323). For them, the museum profession was a calling; they had a strong work ethic and they perhaps identified themselves with the higher social classes (Drake 1994, 6–8, as cited in Hieta 2012, 41).

The third museum generation was active from the 1960s to the 1990s (Drake 1994, 6–8, as cited in Hieta 2012, 41). They lived at a time when the Finnish welfare system was expanding and becoming more comprehensive in its coverage, when more people had the opportunity for higher education and when the public sector was able to recruit a larger workforce (Palviainen 2010, 324; Hieta 2012, 41). Since the 1960s, the number of museum workers grew from that of a small elite into a more heterogeneous group, and the ruling hierarchy of the previous generations was questioned (Neitola 2019, 14–15). As discussed in Chapter 2, at this time professional training and standards developed, and specialised professional groups within the museum field were formed. While the previous generations had admittedly been crucial in the founding period of the Finnish museum field, the third generation carried out many structural reforms that continue to affect museums and their overarching role (Neitola 2019, 16; Vilkuna 2018, 97).[19]

Globally, the female workforce in museums has grown exponentially from the 19th century to the present day, and it has become more commonplace to study museum women of late (see, e.g. Baldwin & Ackerson 2017; Hill 2016; Levin 2010). Of the thirty-six interviewees included in this study, 20 were with women and 16 with men. Of the 52 interviews listed in the database, 22 of the interviewees were women and 21 men.[20] According to information gathered by the FMA in 2008, 77 per cent of employees working in professionally maintained museums are women and 23 per cent men (Finnish Museums Association 2008). The reasons for why this ratio does not correspond with the gender ratio of the group of interviewees can only be a matter of speculation at this point. Perhaps men were still more often in positions of power in the museum field and were therefore considered more valuable sources of information. The role of women in the Finnish museum history would still deserve a study of its own (see, however, Kiianmies 2012; Palviainen 2010; Spoof 2003; Sjöberg-Pietarinen 1997).

---

[19] Solveig Sjöberg-Pietarinen has introduced another way of defining the different generations of museum workers: according to her, the different generations of *collectors, trustees* and *intermediaries* cannot be pinned strictly to any specific time period, but rather each museum goes through them at their own pace (Sjöberg-Pietarinen 1997, 6–7; see also Hieta 2012, 40).

[20] Some individuals were interviewed several times, and sometimes more than one interviewee took part in the same interview.

As the material was already gathered before the beginning of my own research, I have not been able to affect the content of the interviews. Despite the challenges, I still believe the material to be useful, especially when the interview partners were well acquainted with one another: they talked more freely, reminisced about the past together and touched upon themes that I would not have known about. There are also other arguments for making use of existing material and not doing my own fieldwork: it is a sustainable use of the archives and makes existing archival material better known. The Finnish Museum History Project also gives the material a coherent context.

ETHICAL QUESTIONS

The interview material presents many challenges for the study at hand. In the booklet *Museoiden muistitietopäivät* (2006), Juha Ilvas explains that the goal of collecting oral history is to produce systematic knowledge to be used by researchers, and the oral history project has sought to add individual or private perspectives on issues and events relevant to the interviewees' work (Ilvas 2006, 39). He also points out that an interview is not a private conversation and that it should instead be considered partly failed [translation my own] if the results are only private confessions or comments that cannot be published due to their sensitive nature (Ilvas 2006, 39). According to such criteria, some of the interviews did indeed fail.

Research on human participants should follow ethical standards that include ensuring informed consent, which means that the researcher must explain fully and fairly to those who are being studied the purpose of the research and how it will be carried out — as far as is known at the time — so the participants can decide whether they want to take part in it (Davies 2002, 46–47; Finnish National Board on Research Integrity (TENK) 2019, 50–51). In this study, I have not been in direct contact with the respondents or the interviewees, and so they have had no control over how I have chosen to reproduce their words, as contained in the archives. As mentioned earlier, the interviews were conducted on a voluntary basis, and — in principle — the interviewees have given their consent to the material being used for research purposes and for quotes from the interviews to be published under their name in an 'historicised museum context, in university teaching and in non-commercial communications' [translation my own] (Appendix 2). In some archives, this contract of consent was attached to the files shown to me, but in other archives the interviews had been digitised and I was only guided to the database where I could listen to the recordings. I have assumed that since the archives let me make use of the material, the interviewees have indeed agreed to this approach.

However, some interviews that I transcribed later in the process made me feel a bit uneasy. For example, in one interview the discussants were talking about more sensitive issues, about the interviewee feeling somewhat undervalued within the organisation and wanting reassurance from the interviewer that what was being said would go no further. At one point, the interviewee even requested that the recorder be turned off, but the interviewer neglected to do so. Charlotte Aull Davies (2002, 48) has pointed out that many individuals actually find participation in research a positive experience because 'it gives them a chance to express their opinion or unburden themselves to a sympathetic outsider'. This certainly took place in the interview in question, but it was also explicitly stressed that the opinions were not to be made public. Davies (2002, 51) also reminds us that 'researchers must be cautious about the degree of confidentiality they promise' to their informants. The research participants must also be made aware that it is not possible to fully guarantee 'that other researchers who will have access to the material – – will deal with their disclosures as sympathetically' (Davies 2002, 48). Thus, even if the interviewees did sign a contract of consent, it cannot always be assumed to be *informed consent*. I respect these principles and have strived to treat the interviewees with sympathy. The contents of the interview discussed above were incredibly interesting and illustrated many points that I have wanted to raise in my research, but I still felt the confidential information was not intended for my ears. Thus, it has not been quoted in this study.

In the first two research articles, I referred to the interview material by the interviewees' full names and felt like I was following the rules of the interview project and of the journals where the articles were published.[21]

[21] When referring to the questionnaire material, I used the archival codes provided by the FLS.

However, after coming across the more 'difficult' interviews, I began to rethink this policy. In my defence, the names of the interviewees can all readily be found in the online database, and I do not think I caused significant risks, damage or harm to the research participants, communities or other subjects of research (TENK 2019, 50). I do not believe that I have raised sensitive issues when using the interviewees' own names, and highly intimate subjects, health or the interviewees' political views were not discussed in the interviews in the first place. Furthermore, the interviewees who held positions of power in the museum field were and are well known, and as Davies points out, it is not always possible to provide anonymity when doing research on public figures because sometimes the research 'necessitates that respondents be identified in terms of their public position' (Davies 2002, 52).

The interviewers were not explicitly asked for their consent to use the interview material. Some of the interviews used in this study were conducted as part of a master's thesis project, but usually the interviewers' backgrounds were not explained. In some cases, the interviewers are not even named on the record. Perhaps their output was not regarded as being as important as the words of the interviewees, but they nonetheless had a significant impact on how the material was produced. After all, the interviewers controlled the interview situation and chose how to use the interview template. In some interviews, they also revealed much about their own history, and therefore I have treated them similarly as the other informants in this study.

RESEARCHER'S POSITION

The field of museum studies is not unfamiliar to me: both before and after my graduation in 2011, I worked in several museums as a guard, an intern and a museum assistant or as part of a temporary workforce on digitalisation projects. Since the beginning of this research project, I have not been associated with any museum. Still, I do not have any personal experiences from the museum field in the late 20th century — I have only heard about museum work during those times through stories — and thus I do not have shared experiences and understandings with the interviewees (see, e.g. Čeginskas 2016, 43). I also differ from the museum professionals analysed in this study in the sense that I do not have a long career behind me that would give me a personal perspective on changes in work practices. In relation to museum work, I mostly identify myself as a newcomer or an outsider trying to break into the field.

To be quite open, this research project began with my own desire to study a museum-related topic and gain more practice in using archival material. As I explained at the beginning of the dissertation, I came to my research material by chance. Still, some time after deciding to include the interview material from the Finnish Museum History Project in my pool of material, I realised I had already inadvertently helped with one small aspect of the project. In the summer of 2010, I did an internship in the Museum of Cultures, which was then located in the Tennispalatsi building, in Kamppi, Helsinki. Under the supervision of Ildikó Lehtinen, the curator in charge of the Finno-Ugrian collections, I learned about managing collections and cataloguing museum objects: documenting, describing, measuring, handling, photographing, storing and contextualising them. As one of my tasks, I also assisted Lehtinen when she interviewed an old colleague of hers – as part of the Finnish Museum History Project – and transcribed the interview for archival purposes. Later, it turned out that the transcript had gone missing, and as part of my own research project, I had to transcribe the same interview again.

I remember the interview situation well. We were all sitting in the exhibition rooms of the museum — perhaps it was on a Monday or before opening hours — and it was my responsibility to handle the recording device. It was a Minidisc recorder, which I luckily knew about from my university courses, but I still had to pay careful attention to when to insert a new disc. I had the feeling that the people and the topics that were being discussed were quite significant, but I usually did not know much about the content of the conversation. I can also hear myself on the tape once, asking the interview partners to clarify a nickname I did not know. Now I wish I had had the courage to interrupt more often.

Some of the interviewers might have had their own projects in mind when they were planning and conducting the interviews. Often the interviewer and the interviewee were friends or old colleagues, and the conversations were quite personal. Depending on the interviewer, the objective of the meeting might have also been to obtain complementary information about the history of the museum's collections or to discuss funding policies in the museum field. Sometimes keeping up with the discussions would have required more background knowledge and reading through the same archival material and minutes of the meetings that the interviewer had studied.

Miia-Leena Tiili describes how, during her fieldwork, many of the interviewees expressed their concern about whether she was interviewing 'the right people' and if she was therefore capable of putting what she heard in the right perspective (Tiili 2016, 50). According to Tiili, these discussions can be seen as efforts to control both the information produced as part of the research project and the selection of the members of the community who were allowed to speak as "experts" (Tiili 2016, 50). I may not have been 'in the field' in the same sense as ethnographers who are more physically present in the lives of their interviewees. Instead, I went to the archives to listen to recordings of the interviews, and I discussed my on-going research with the personnel of the archives and my colleagues in research seminars and conferences, many of whom also had connections to the museum field. During this fieldwork period, I was frequently asked similar questions about whose interviews and perspectives I had heard, and I received suggestions about people who I should still interview on my own to gain a 'fuller picture' about certain events. Explaining that my plan was to limit my research to the existing interview material was not only a question of resources or a useful way to find some cohesion in the research project, but it was also an easy and neutral answer to provide in such situations. I admit to sometimes feeling perplexed, naïve and ignorant: Was I the right person to analyse this material if I was so clearly unaware of the things that were really interesting? However, these conversations also assured me that there are stories in the museum field that people feel need to be heard.

In the end, I feel more confident that the possibility of other interpretations does not diminish the value of my interpretation. Being a bit of an insider and a bit of an outsider gives me enough background knowledge and freedom to question what is being said in the material. Discussing my analysis with my colleagues in ethnology and museum studies has also assured me that my findings resonate with the thoughts and feelings of others.

4. WORKING WITH THE MATERIAL

QUALITATIVE RESEARCH PROCESS

REFLEXIVE RESEARCH

Ethnological research has been characterised as 'mildly constructivist', which means that ethnologists study discourses and narratives without assuming that they necessarily tell 'the truth' [translation my own] (Åström 2005, 40–41; Hieta 2012, 29; see also Raatikainen 2005, 55–56). This approach also usually includes a certain amount of realism: even though ethnologists often adhere to analysing texts, they also pay attention to people's actions outside discourses, which indicates a search for something additional beyond just the language of the texts — even if they can mainly be interpreted through language (Åström 2005, 40-41; Hieta 2012, 29). According to Åstrom, in the end it is the practices and processes behind the speech that ethnologists want to access (Åström 2005, 41).

In ethnology, the purpose of research can be described, according to Charlotte Aull Davies, a lecturer in sociology and anthropology, as a process of mediating 'between different constructions of reality' in order to increase 'understanding of these varying constructions, among which is included the [researcher's] own constructions', (Davies 2002, 6). According to Davies, one of the pillars of social research is a belief that through the means of analysis, we are able 'to learn about things outside ourselves, not knowable through introspection' (Davies 2002, 16). Davies also claims that research can express 'a reality that is neither accessible directly through [empirical material] nor simply a reflection of the individual [researcher's] psyche' (Davies 2002, 6). Davies suggests that there are certain criteria — but not rigid rules — for good research that lend authority to the researcher (Davies 2002, 6). A well-crafted research project is based on empirical evidence, informed by reflexivity and evaluated by a critical scholarly community (Davies 2002, 6). Her primary point is that researchers should incorporate *reflexivity* in all phases of their research process (Davies 2002, 6, 199–200). For this reason, I have also chosen not to summarise my thoughts about reflexivity in any single chapter, but instead will reflect on them in relation to the methodological discussion.

The call for reflexivity also follows the ideas of *(Gadamerian) hermeneutics*. The term *hermeneutics* is derived from the Greek words *hermeneia* — explanation, translation — and *hermeneutikos* — translator, interpreter (Mikkola 2009a, 49). The researcher's task, as understood within hermeneutics, is to interpret other worlds and other discourses and make them understandable in the present context (Mikkola 2009a, 49). The three key components of Hans-Georg Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics are *reflexivity*, *dialogue* and *interpretation* (McCaffrey, Raffin-Bouchal, & Moules 2012, 217). Here, *reflexivity* means that the researcher explains his or her prior understanding of the research field and is aware of how his or her understanding evolves throughout the research process (McCaffrey et al. 2012, 217). This is linked to the idea of a circle of understanding, or *hermeneutic circle*, which illustrates the evolving structure of understanding and interpretation (Mikkola 2009a, 49). The second component, *dialogue*, signifies encounters with other sources of information. In these encounters, the researcher's presuppositions are exposed to new light, which leads to a shift in his or her understanding and a reshaping of the hermeneutic circle (McCaffrey et al. 2012, 217–218).

Thus, *interpretation* does not occur at the end of the research project but rather takes place constantly. When qualitative research is conducted based on Gadamer's hermeneutic philosophy, the interpretation is always first based on the researcher's prior assumptions and prejudices (Jouhki & Steel 2016, 29). In ethnology, this aspect of the research is usually realised already in the choice of research topic, as ethnologists are often interested in topics familiar to them from their own lives (Jouhki & Steel 2016, 29). Tytti Steel and Jukka Jouhki have pointed out that actually, choosing a research topic and compiling the research material are already acts of interpretation (Jouhki & Steel 2016, 27).

The process of reflection is an integral part of the hermeneutic circle (Ala-Pöllänen 2017, 21). Reflexivity in research means that one acknowledges the researcher's relationship to the object of research, is aware of the factors that have influenced the analytical process, understands how knowledge is being constructed in one's research project and articulates this awareness in the final text (Tiili 2016, 36; Davies 2002, 4, 7–8). However, there is a difference between *reflexivity* and *self-reflection*: in the end, research is the product of a researcher's thought processes, but the focus should still be on understanding the research object and not the researcher (Mikkola 2009a, 51; Tiili 2016, 37; Sykäri 2012, 82; Davies 2002, 15; Aaltonen & Högbacka 2015, 9).

Being reflexive also intersects with the issue of research ethics. Being reflexive not only means that the researcher acknowledges that he or she might have been steered by certain preconditions and outside influences — it also means that in being aware of this fact, the researcher can make informed decisions and explain and justify them to the readers. In my opinion, this also means that the researcher should be mindful of the words, concepts and terms being used and the meanings and connotations they have in different contexts. Reflexivity in the research process concerns not only the researcher's relationships with the research object, but also with the field of science, various funding organisations, theories and society in general (Aaltonen & Högbacka 2015, 10).

A researcher that is reflexive does not deny the possibility of other kinds of interpretations — even though the 'truthfulness' and level of accuracy of different interpretations can be debatable (Raatikainen 2005, 56–57). However, the researcher's task is to provide explanations and not mere descriptions (Davies 2002, 18), and he or she needs to assure the readers that they would come to similar conclusions based on the selected material and methods. I believe that, when the study is supported by extensive empirical data and good argumentation, and when the data is presented and evaluated in as correct and honest a manner as possible, the findings will add up to more than just a single researcher's subjective interpretation (Davies 2002, 200; Raatikainen 2005, 57).

Gadamerian hermeneutics describe what happens in the research process but does not provide guidelines for how research *should* be done (Mikkola 2009a, 50). The requirement to be reflexive does not limit the choice of methods or methodologies either. The act of producing dialectical knowledge that takes place in the hermeneutical circle can be intentionally utilised through *dialogical methodology*, which stresses the intersubjective and cumulative nature of the data *produced*, not *gathered,* by a researcher (Sykäri 2012, 81). Here, *dialogue* should be understood as a meaning-making process that occurs through the use of language, and it covers all human communication and cognition (Linell 2009, 3–4). According to Sykäri, when dialogical methods are applied, 'the overall research process is a multi-voiced hermeneutic circle', where the researcher enters into dialogues with informants and existing research data as well as the academic community and all other relevant material in order to increase 'the diversity of perspectives and for reconstructing understandable wholes' (Sykäri 2012, 82).

A dialogical methodology can be applied to examine human interactions in the research field — between a researcher and interviewees — but also to the research of textual material. George Marcus and Michael M. J. Fischer (1986, 68) introduced the notion of dialogue as metaphor in the 1980s to 'refer to the practical efforts to present multiple voices within a text, and to encourage reading from diverse perspectives' (Sykäri 2012, 81). In recent decades, Finnish folklorists and ethnologists have created their own dialogical methods for working with archival materials (Sykäri 2012, 81; see also Hakamies 2016; Saarikoski 2014; Koskinen-Koivisto 2014; Vasenkari & Pekkala 2000). This means that the researcher engages in dialectical exchanges or 'conversations' with the textual research material, and the different historical and social contexts of the material are studied together with its creation process (e.g. Ruusuvuori et al. 2010; Sykäri 2012, 81).

Within the framework of dialogical methodology, one can still choose to use different methods to 'converse' with the text: close reading or thick description, for example. By posing alternative questions with respect to the material, the researcher can gain an understanding of 'how the texts speak, and particularly, to which questions they answer' (Sykäri 2012, 82). The close reading of the material does not need to be understood as a literal dialogue, but as a process where the researcher tries out different approaches and methods to find the one(s) that best make(s) sense of the material. Panu Raatikainen (2005, 59) suggests that in fact the style of reasoning in the humanities does not differ that much from the scientific process of natural sciences, as they are both usually based on invention and testing of hypotheses. Likewise in the humanities, the researcher presents a general interpretative hypothesis based on his or her background assumptions and then tests it in relation to the material at hand, such as a text. The researcher then deduces whether or not his or her interpretative hypothesis is correct based on the various sections of material (Raatikainen 2005, 59). When unpacking her research process, Laura Hirvi described the process of looking for theoretical concepts that would help in reading the data and structuring her analysis as akin to looking for 'a proper pair of glasses' (2013, 40). Finding the right terms and concepts to explain the research object means going back and forth between the material and various theories: sometimes wrong glasses make the text grow blurry, until one finds the right ones (Hirvi 2013, 40–41).

As Charlotte Aull Davies has pointed out, if research is to be recognised and taken seriously, it must 'be relevant to some of the current intellectual concerns of the discipline' (Davies 2002, 27). When forming the research questions, the research should be located 'within on-going theoretical debates' (Davies 2002, 38). Theories not only connect the research to a research field and academic discussions, they are also actual research tools. Theories can help us sharpen our research questions, narrow the scope, guide the interpretative process and lend 'depth' to one´s analysis through abstraction (Åström 2005, 25, 31). To better understand the different nuances of our material, we must first get close to it, but to discover patterns and variations in it we have to, at the same time, distance ourselves from it (Åström 2005, 32). Hence, we need help from theoretical and analytical concepts (Åström 2005, 32).

Theories merely form the basis for interpretation, they do not explain empirical phenomena on their own (Åström 2005, 31). As Anna-Maria Åström points out, the relationship between empiria and theory is dialectical, and the researcher must constantly shift his or her perspective between the two. In analysing and shedding light on the empirical material, researchers offer interpretations within the framework of a theory, or within the framework of a theoretically conceivable explanation, but with a clear reference to what is happening in concrete reality (Åström 2005, 31). This dialectical way of working is not strictly standardised and cannot be planned ahead to the very last detail; it is instead dependent on the researcher's skills (Ala-Pöllänen 2017, 20). It can still be seen as an asset: the defining trait of ethnology is that it is strongly grounded in empiricism, and therefore, ethnological research will always provide new information and contribute to existing theories.

This dialectical approach, quite common in ethnology, is also close to Derek Layder's notion of *adaptive theory*. An adaptive theory is shaped by 'incoming evidence while the data itself is simultaneously filtered through, and is thus adapted by the prior theoretical materials (frameworks, concepts, ideas) that are relevant to their analysis' (Layder 1998, 5, 133). As Layder emphasises, adaptive theory is distinctly different from the grounded theory approach, in which the theories and concepts explaining the empiric field are based on, and *grounded* solely in, the research material. It is impossible to approach one's research topic in a theory-neutral manner or analyse and explain the material without any previous assumptions or ideas (Layder 1998, 4–5, 113). Therefore, it is better that the researcher acknowledges the possible contributions of prior theory as they 'make themselves felt in the research process' (Layder 1998, 4–5). In fact, a general theory can provide useful 'background stimuli in the form of concepts and chains of reasoning associated with wider conceptual clusters' (Layder 1998, 40).

Still, forcing a general theory into the research process can result in using the given theoretical concepts merely as decoration and relying on former explanations regardless of whether they correlate with the empirical material or not (Layder 1998, 23; see also Åström 2005, 31). Thus, general theories should not be regarded as 'perfected end-products' that monopolise 'the truth', and they should not be used in a dogmatic manner (Layder 1998, 40). One should also be aware that whenever a frame of reference is selected and related concepts are used to code the material in a certain way, certain ideas or matters are made visible, but others are always left out (Aaltonen & Högbacka 2015, 21). As Löfgren and Wilk (2006, 7) point out, '(w)e have trouble seeing things for which we have no mental image or template'. Therefore, being reflexive means that one should also reflect on how the choice of theory has affected the analysis.

DOING THE RESEARCH

Declaring one's position with respect to the research field is not enough on its own to make the research reflexive and transparent if the researcher's methods are not equally explicated (e.g. Aaltonen & Högbacka 2015, 12). Reflexive research requires examining the results in relation to how information is produced, organised and interpreted throughout the research process (Aaltonen & Högbacka 2015, 12). Jouhki and Steel have noted that while the authors of recent Finnish ethnological dissertations have carefully described the process by which the research material was acquired and how they arrived at their position in relation to the research field, the same amount of effort has not been put into describing the analytical process, the reason for interpreting the material in a certain manner or the actual writing process (Jouhki & Steel 2016, 13–18). They call this the 'dark phase' of the ethnological analysis process (Jouhki & Steel 2016, 18). Next, I shed light on this part of my research process.

The pragmatic part of organising my material has not been guided by any particular method as such but has instead been rather intuitive in nature. When becoming familiar with my empirical material, I made initial notes on themes that occurred frequently or topics that seemed important or strangely contradictory or that just resonated with something else in my mind. I wrote brief summaries of the interviews and the topics discussed in them and made a chart of the time periods covered in the interviews. I transcribed the interviews and the archived questionnaire answers on my laptop. After first attempting to code the produced material with Atlas.ti software, I soon realised that for my purposes the search functions of a regular text editing programme sufficed. Working with the material in this way — listening and reading the material, copying the words, highlighting certain words or parts of the text — provided me with some preliminary ideas on *what it is about*, but the ultimate answer to this question was not formulated until writing the final version of this study. As Sanna Aaltonen and Riitta Högbacka (2015, 20) have pointed out, critically examining the material produced and reflecting on what it tells us and how it can be used — and, accordingly, what the material cannot tell us — is a necessary part of research reflexivity.

In the final written research report, the research project is often presented as a logical and unilinear process, one that includes first identifying the problem, then collecting the data, followed by analysing it and writing up the results and formulating conclusions (Davies 2002, 26–27). The usual model of research is to begin with 'a specified set of questions and general area of enquiry that allows both a sharpening of the questions and a gradual development of a theoretical explanation as a part of the ongoing interplay between theorizing and collecting data' (Davies 2002, 31). However, the reality of doing research is usually quite different. Quite often, the experiences that one gains when doing fieldwork or the knowledge gained during the first stages of analysis can fundamentally alter the theorical aspect of the research project, 'to the point of changing the focus entirely and actually altering the theoretical questions being investigated' (Davies 2002, 31).

My interests and research questions were also initially quite different, but in familiarising myself with the content of the material I abandoned some ideas and adopted new ones. The first research questions informing this project were mostly based on previous studies. I formed my understanding of the material based on previous research done as part of the Finnish Museum History Project and the related questionnaire and interview questions, which is usually the first stage of analysis. Initially, I was interested in the earlier years of Finnish museum history, as were the people who drew up the questions for the questionnaire *Esinekeruusta entisaikaan* (On Collecting Artefacts in Former Times). However, as I became more familiar with the material and my own analysis progressed, I began to identify my own points of interest. My attention also started to shift to the interview material, which seemed to me more fruitful. Why were certain questions asked in the interviews, and others avoided? What sort of topics have not yet been dealt with in the literature? What topics seem important to the respondents themselves? I started paying closer attention to words and concepts that seemed value-laden. For example, when talking about 'museum people' the interviewees were clearly also talking about the value hierarchy of different work practices, professional identity and recognition, and dissonance in their work communities (Article I, 142).

I have described my approach as a 'rather material-based approach', but alongside the research material I also read literature on practice theory, which was initially introduced to me by supervisor Hanna Snellman in our first meetings. I would describe the way that I 'use' theory as being comparable to an imaginary play or game of pretence: If what is said as a point of theory would apply to the empirical material at hand, what then would be the outcome? What form would the patterns, abstractions and structures suggested by the theory take in the material? In choosing practice theory as a frame of reference, I have also aimed to bring a certain cohesiveness to my work: an overarching perspective that ties all the articles together.

I have also found Derek Layder's idea of using *orienting concepts* as a means to 'crank up' the process of analysis and theorizing very inspiring: 'By using such concepts as orienting devices the researcher is provided with preliminary means of ordering and giving shape to a mass of data' (Layder 1998, 23–24). The selected concepts may or may not be related to a wider theoretical framework and discourse, but they can also be drawn from 'all manner of books (fiction and non-fiction), magazines, documents, videos, and so on' that may serve as 'sources of insight which have eventual theoretical significance' (Layder 1998, 101, 106). Orienting concepts can be used as 'background concepts' that give direction in the initial stages of the analysis by suggesting certain ideas, ways of explaining the data and new lines of empirical inquiry and by indicating what 'topics, areas and people should be investigated next' (Layder 1998, 110–111). They enable the researcher to code, thematise or impose meaningful patterns on the material (Layder 1998, 109). However, they should be understood as a provisional means of ordering the data, some of which may be modified or dropped later on (Layder 1998, 108–109). As Löfgren and Wilk (2006, 9) remind us, 'we must allow ourselves to experiment with labels and concepts', and re-labelling can make 'you see aspects that were previously hidden'.

My initial orienting concepts were drawn from the extant practice theory literature, and they include *practices*, *the elements of practices*, *the meanings of practices* and *communities of practice*. These *etic* concepts, or points of consideration, connect my research to other theoretical negotiations and have helped me 'interrogate' my empirical material (Layder 1998, 109–111; Mikkola 2009a, 34). They have inspired me to look at how identities are constructed by processes of inclusion and exclusion, to examine the relationship between *doing something* and *being someone*, and to assess just what is needed to carry out a practice in the 'right' way. When applied to specific material, these questions have in turn spurred other questions. For example: How are the borders of communities constructed in the museum field, and what are the meaningful practices that define such limits? These ideas have guided me in selecting new analytical, *emic* concepts from the material based on the interviews or questionnaire responses (Åström 2005, 33). These include *museum people*, *dust* and *real museum work*. It should be stressed that in the context of this study, these 'practitioner-defined' concepts have still been constructed by me to illustrate particular points of analysis (see Layder 1998, 102). As the research progressed, some 'hypotheses' proved incompatible with the material, and the initial orienting concepts to a certain extent proved provisional. Balancing between theory and the empirical material has led me to place my focus on three theoretical concepts that correspond in the research articles with the emic concepts mentioned above: *communities of practice* (Article I), *practice-as-elements* (Article II) and *change in a practice* (Article III). I summarise practice theory and examine the potential of the three concepts in the following section.

Practical issues also affected the research process. The availability of books and ideas — or the unavailability of them due to distance or a lack of licences — always influences our thinking. Choosing to write in English provided me with more choice when looking for journals in which to publish my research articles and enabled me to have a second supervisor with a broader background knowledge of the international museum field: Suzie Thomas. Her ideas and advice have definitely enriched my text. Writing in a language other than my mother tongue and finding the right expressions has at times been challenging. On the other hand, it has caused me to pay closer attention to the meanings of words. For instance, playing with the word *practice* and its different meanings in English has concretely affected the perspectives of my analysis, which would not have been possible had I chosen to write in Finnish.

My choice to do an article-based doctoral dissertation also influenced the way in which the analytical process progressed. In the very first draft of Article I, I wanted to present all the different themes and perspectives that I had identified as being important, and the review comments made me realise how much I needed to limit my scope to write a cohesive article. Handling the material in 'article-sized chunks' means I have not been able to cover everything in the research field or dwell on the topics as much or as thoroughly as one might when writing a monograph. With time, my understanding of communities of practice, for example, has broadened, and if I were to rewrite the first article now, it might look rather different. Thus, the research articles included in this dissertation also encapsulate a certain point in the analytical process, but this is true for any research report. However, I believe that the structure of the dissertation has not affected the main outcomes of this research project. In a monograph I might have been able to say more about the research topics from broader perspectives and enriched with more examples, but sometimes less is more, and summarising the message can also refine it.

To summarise, I followed the hermeneutic tradition wherein my role as a researcher was more that of an interpreter. To ensure that my interpretation is as reliable as possible, I committed myself to reflexivity in the research process, meaning I was sensitive to how my prior assumptions, existing literature, colleagues, general academic discussions, the empirical material at hand, and so forth, all affected the analytical process underpinning this study. Being aware of the dialectical nature of accumulated knowledge, I have applied a dialogical methodology and tested different approaches or questions on the research material. I find that the idea of orienting concepts describes this part of the process accurately. The framework of practice theory has helped me to better order the material and gain critical distance from it through abstraction (Åström 2005, 25, 31). However, in the course of the research project the problems, concepts and contents of the empirical material have intermittently taken front stage.

PRACTICE THEORY

BACKGROUND TO PRACTICE THEORY

Practice theory relies on the idea that social life is centred around *practices* (Hui, Schatzki, & Shove 2017, 1). In common language, practices, or *practicing*, can refer to learning by doing, as opposed to more theoretical book learning, to an occupation, such as a medical or legal practice, or to a shared understanding of 'how something is done' (Corradi, Gherardi & Verzelloni. 2010, 279, note 1). Within the field of practice theory, one could also choose any of these areas as a research topic: the social learning that occurs when an individual adopts new shared practices, professionalism and how professional practices are developed, cherished and sustained, or even 'how practitioners recognize, produce and formulate the scenes and regulations of everyday affairs' (Corradi et al. 2010, 279, note 1).

Within practice theory, practices are understood as recognisable ways of doing something. An oft-cited definition by Andreas Reckwitz suggests that practices include forms of bodily and mental activities, '"things" and their use' and background knowledge, like 'know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge' (Reckwitz 2002, 249). Reckwitz considers practices also to include routinised ways 'in which bodies are moved, objects are handled, subjects are treated, things are described and the world is understood'. Gennica Corradi, Silvia Gherardi and Luca Verzelloni, sociologists in the field of working life studies, note the paradox that while the term *practice* has the connotation of being something transferable and teachable, an object of study, practices are 'not directly accessible, observable, measurable or definable; rather, they are hidden, tacit and often linguistically inexpressible in a propositional sense' (Corradi et al. 2010, 267).

Practices always include both explicit and tacit sides, and as the practices are carried out, they express and reproduce meanings acknowledged and understood by other practitioners (Wenger 1998, 47). To be recognised and interpreted as a practice, it must be shared with others. Therefore, practices are fundamentally *social* and *contextual* (Wenger 1998, 47). Reckwitz (2017,

114) has noted that since social practices — even embodied routines — depend on implicit schemes of collective knowledge, they are always, as such, *cultural* practices. Since practices are anchored in bodies and artefacts, they are also *material* practices (Reckwitz 2017, 114).

As a social theory, practice theory challenges *rational theory* and the assumptions that the actions people take can be explained by the pursuit of individual interests and that 'lifestyles and behaviours are expressions of personal choice' (Shove et al 2012, 2). Even though from a discursive standpoint people might account for their actions and believe they are making conscious choices, their capability 'to "go on" through the flow of largely routinized social life depends on forms of practical knowledge' (Shove et al. 2012, 3). Instead of privileging individual agency or various social systems and structures, practice theory reveals the relationship between the two. Practice theorists claim that social life is defined by practices, which form loose structures that are constantly being renewed when the practices are performed, varied and renegotiated (Schatzki 2001, 12). Thus, people's actions are shaped and enabled by loose structures of rules and meanings, but these structures are, at the same time, being 'reproduced in the flow of human action' (Giddens 1984, 25, as cited in Shove et al. 2012, 3). Or, from an ethnologist's point of view, 'people make cultures and cultures make people' (Hirvi 2013, 12).

The most notable developers of practice theory have been characterised as the first and second generations of practice theorists — the first generation includes Anthony Giddens (1979), Pierre Bourdieu (1977), Jean Lave and Étienne Wenger (Lave & Wenger 1991), while the second includes Theodore Schatzki (2001), Andreas Reckwitz (2002), Silvia Gherardi (2006), Elizabeth Shove, Mika Pantzar and Matt Watson (2012), and Sherry Ortner (2006), to name a few (Hui et al. 2017, 1; Stark 2009, 7). The first generation introduced the concept of practice into theoretical debates in the social sciences, but according to Shove, Pantzar and Watson (2012, 5) the works that really marked 'the start of what has become a diffuse movement' were a series of essays in *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory* (Schatzki 2001).

There is much disagreement in the field of practice theory. Since scholars can agree on no single concise theory, it has been suggested that one should rather talk about *practice approach(es)* or *practice thought* (Schatzki 2001, 11, 13, 22). The terms *practice theory* or *practice-based studies* are perhaps more widely recognisable, but they could be considered 'umbrella-concepts' (Corradi et al. 2010, 278). Gennica Corradi, Silvia Gherardi and Luca Verzelloni point out that before the 2000s — and Schatzki's influential work — researchers understood practice as an empirical object, and in such cases the focus was on studying the activities of its practitioners (Corradi et al. 2010, 268). After the year 2000, researchers joining 'the bandwagon' of those conducting practice-based studies moved towards explicitly acknowledging practice as an epistemology, and terms like 'practice-oriented research', 'knowing-in-practice', 'practice-based perspective' and 'practice-based approaches' became popular (Corradi et al. 2010, 268, 273).

Considering practices as an epistemology and a way of knowing and making sense of the world opens up space for new interpretations. The concept of practice becomes a lens through which one can observe all social life: all social phenomena, such as meaning, power, language, social institutions and historical transformation, occur in a *field of practices* (Schatzki 2001, 11). By Schatzki's definition, a field of practices is the nexus of all practices, where social life takes place and where 'embodied, materially interwoven practices centrally organized around shared practical understandings' occur (Schatzki 2001, 12). Put more simply: we live in a world that is made up of intertwined social practices. Therefore, all social phenomena should — or could — be analysed as part of the field of practices (Schatzki 2001, 12).

To understand a practice, one has to take into account the social dimensions and contexts related to it. For example, Gherardi stresses that a practice is more than a definable set of activities; it is also 'a social relationship between the practice and those who create and support it' (Gherardi 2015, 15, 20). One should not overlook the fact that practitioners can have an intellectual, passionate, ethical and aesthetic attachment to practices, objects and places of practices as well as to other practitioners (Gherardi 2012, 225; 2015, 20). Thus, at least in one branch of practice-oriented research, the focus has shifted from the practice itself to the social dimensions surrounding it, and the researcher's attention is thus redirected to the processes that keep social and cultural practices 'alive' (Gherardi 2015, 15).

Practices as a term and object of research is and has long been present in ethnological studies, but not necessarily in the context of practice theory. As

Laura Stark (2009, 4) has pointed out, ethnologists have long been interested in mundane, everyday practices, but usually 'from the perspective of their function in maintaining an older way of life labelled "folk culture"'. On the other hand, according to Konrad Köstlin (2014, 11), 'European Ethnology is always intimately involved in its research objects, *making sense of our practices* [emphasis added] and of the things with which we surround ourselves'.

Perhaps out of fear of using the given theoretical concepts too mechanically or merely as 'decoration' (Layder 1998, 23), of relying too much on previous interpretations (Ehn & Löfgren 1982, 97), or of appearing old-fashioned in an academic community that emphasises *holism* (Steel & Jouhki 2016, 20; Ala-Pöllänen 2017, 19, 21–23), ethnologists tend to shun the jargon of thickly woven theoretical frameworks.[22] However, one can also argue that new theoretical turns are reinvigorating ethnology because they create cross-disciplinary dialogues, pose new challenges and enrich cultural analysis (Löfgren 2014a, 78; Löfgren & Wilk 2006, 5). I believe that the interests of ethnology can join with the interests of practice theory. Indeed, themes such as the rhythm of daily life, cultural maintenance and the innovative processes embedded in everyday activities and practices — which appeal both to ethnologists and practice theorists — have already given rise to many cross-disciplinary discussions (Löfgren 2014b, 120; Shove & Pantzar 2006; Shove & Pantzar 2010; Gherardi 2012, 218).

Some ethnologists have also made use of practice theory in their analysis. In a special issue of *Ethnologia Fennica* dedicated to modernisation, practice and power, the concept of *practice* is introduced as part of the theoretical framework of practice studies (Stark 2009). Stark and her research group suggest that the modernisation of Finnish society 'consisted of changes is everyday practices implemented by ordinary persons who saw in these changes opportunities for empowerment and agency' (Stark 2009, 5, 7). The theoretical vocabulary of practice theory is not always present in the articles, but as Stark explains, the authors in the issue discuss, for example, 'active' objects that generated agency, gave rise to new practices and represented new

[22] On the other hand, Bueger (2017, 128) argues that practice theorists 'are not interested in building closed, abstract, general systems of theory', but instead they want 'to understand the messiness of practice and hence concentrate on so-called low-level theorizing and anthropological reasoning'.

territories of potential practices that had to be negotiated and domesticated (Stark 2009, 11; Mikkola 2009b, Turunen 2009, Tuomaala 2009).

There are also examples of ethnological studies where *practice* is understood as an analytical concept. For instance, in her doctoral dissertation Laura Hirvi (2013, 13) studied how Sikhs negotiate their identities through their everyday practices in order to understand the complex strategies by which they position themselves in society. According to Hirvi, identities are constructed though practice, and practices reflect the process of negotiating an identity (Hirvi 2013, 26). In Hirvi's view, practice is 'an action that is conditioned by discursive constraints and normative expectations' (Hirvi 2013, 28). A practice theory framework also has a constitutive role in Matilda Marshall's doctoral dissertation on sustainable eating practices. She demonstrates how different and sometimes disparate food-related practices are linked by a shared meaning of being sustainable (Marshall 2016, 223). Marshall (2016, 54) sees practice theory as a useful methodological and theoretical instrument for analysing routinised activities and forms of speech. In her opinion, studying practices — how routinised, embodied practices, knowledge about how something is done and ways of understanding the world — can illuminate how the 'everyday is done' (Marshall 2016, 54). As Marshall (2016, 222) puts it, '[i]n an ethnological sense, studying practices is studying culture'.

COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

The concept *community of practice* was developed in the 1980s by Jean Lave, an anthropologist, and Etienne Wenger, an educational theorist, who defined it as a 'set of relations among persons, activity, and world, over time and in relation with other tangential and overlapping communities of practice' (Lave and Wenger, 1991, 98). A community of practice is an informal community defined through its shared practices and bound together by shared engagement, enterprise and a repertoire of stories, concepts and styles (Wenger 1998, 72–73). It evolves in 'organic ways that tend to escape formal descriptions and control' (Wenger 2010b, 131), it does not necessarily have geographical boundaries, nor can it be reduced to a set of formal structures

(Wenger 2010b, 130–131). According to Wenger (2010a, 179), a community of practice can be viewed as a simple social system, but it can also be understood as a context through which practices gain meaning and where 'social relations among people, and between people and the material and cultural world, stabilize and become normatively sustained' (Corradi et al. 2010, 268).

The community of practice concept is related to social learning theory, in which learning is understood as a social process of meaning-making. In Wenger's view, engaging in various social contexts involves a dual process of meaning-making: on the one hand, people engage in and participate in different social activities, while on the other they 'produce physical and conceptual artifacts – – that reflect our shared experience and around which we organize our participation' (Wenger 2010a, 180). Within a community, this process also includes judging what is worth knowing and what skills are useful (Wenger 2010a, 180.) Over time, the 'participants define a "regime of competence," a set of criteria and expectations by which they recognize membership' (Wenger 2010a, 180). This includes understanding what matters and having a shared perspective on the world, being able to engage productively with others in the community and knowing how to use the resources that 'the community has accumulated through its history of learning' (Wenger 2010a, 180). Eventually, the shared history of learning and meaning-making becomes an informal and dynamic social structure that binds the participants together in a community of practice (Wenger 2010a, 180).

There are three points to take from this discussion: 1) knowledge is constructed in social situations, 2) being included in such situations is necessary if one wants to learn 3) and being included in the social learning process is important for one's self-esteem and identity. As Wenger points out, focusing on identity 'adds a human dimension to the notion of practice' (Wenger 2010a, 182). Shove et al. suggest that by 'participating in some practices but not others, individuals locate themselves within society and in so doing simultaneously reproduce specific schemes and structures of meaning and order' (Shove et al. 2012, 54). Participating in chosen practices can reinforce a certain status, but Shove et al. propose that, instead of looking at how social hierarchies are produced, researchers should be more interested in the practitioner's point of view and the impact that certain practices have on individual lives and the chances for people to successfully participate in the field of practices (Shove et al. 2012, 65).

For Wenger, identity is the product of learning, and learning is 'a social becoming' (Wenger 2010a, 182). He finds that developing a practice requires 'a community whose members can engage with one another and thus acknowledge each other as participants' (Wenger 2010b, 133). This entails 'the negotiation of ways of being a person in that context', and thus, 'our practices deal with the profound issue of how to be a human being' (Wenger 2010b, 133). Learning is more than just acquiring skills and information: 'it is becoming a certain person' and 'a knower in a context where what it means to know is negotiated with respect to the regime of competence of a community' (Wenger 2010a, 181). As Wenger (1998, 4, 56–57, 152) has pointed out elsewhere, as full members of a community of practice we feel like we are moving on familiar ground, we know how to act and can interpret the actions of others, and we feel competent and others recognise us as such.

However, communities have borders, and as such certain people are not allowed to participate in meaningful practices and are denied community membership. Wenger identifies two forms of non-participation in relation to communities of practice: peripheral and marginal. Peripheral non-participation means that a person is an outsider in relation to a community of practice but still has a chance of adopting its practices and becoming a member. For example, interns or other young employees are in a peripheral situation. Peripherality is an ambiguous position where access to the community might seem possible, but where outsiders are also prevented from moving further inward (Wenger 2010b, 132). With marginal non-participation, people who seek to be part of a community of practice are somehow not regarded as such by others and are denied a chance to act as full members (Wenger 1998, 166–171). The boundaries might become visible in social interaction in the form of an expression that cannot be understood, a 'mistrusting look from a supervisor' or a 'reference to a past event' (Wenger 2010b, 132).

How people experience non-participation depends on the degree to which they identify with a practice: if they do not identify with a specific community of practice, then they do not feel marginalised if its jargon seems impenetrable (Wenger 2010a, Wenger 2010b, 141). Quite often, we also define our identities through negation; how we relate to a community of practice involves ‘both participation and nonparticipation, and our identities are shaped by combinations of the two’ (Wenger 2010b, 140.).

ELEMENTS OF A PRACTICE

According to Silvia Gherardi, at the beginning of the practice turn practice theorists became interested in identifying the elements of a practice, with several theoretical models being called ‘element-based practice theory’ (Gherardi 2017, 38). One of them, formulated by Elizabeth Shove, Mika Pantzar and Matt Watson (2012),[23] suggests that practices consist of three elements: *competences* — skills, know-how and background knowledge; *materials* — including tangible items and the stuff from which they are made, infrastructures and the body itself; and *meanings* — such as symbolic meanings, ideas and aspirations that are shared and understood similarly by a group of practitioners (Shove et al. 2012, 14, 23).

The practice-as-elements model also includes the idea of the process-like nature of practices (Shove et al. 2012, 4, 14). Shove, Pantzar and Watson make two propositions: first, that social practices consist of the above-mentioned elements, which are integrated when practices are enacted, and second, that the existence of practices depends on the links between those elements (Shove et al. 2021, 21). Thus, it logically follows that the same elements might be components of several different practices, but the way they are linked to other elements is pivotal. If a specific configuration of elements is to remain active, the ‘connections between defining elements have to be renewed time and again’ (Shove et al. 2012, 24). Shove et al. (2012, 31) also point out that the elements co-evolve: a change in one or two elements might affect the rest, essentially changing the whole practice.

Shove et al. (2012, 15) treat the elements as if they could be separated and detached from the practices. They examine the ‘life’ of these elements: how they are interconnected and how such connections break down over time when practices and their cultural or social meanings are reshaped (Shove et al.

[23] Shove et al. have also introduced the concept *practice-as-performance*, which is not discussed here (see Shove et al. 2012).

2012, 21–25). This is a methodological strategy that might seem overly simplified, but the authors argue that it provides the means for 'conceptualizing stability and change' (Shove et al. 2012, 15). In my opinion, it simply helps to look at practices from different perspectives.

The analytical model introduced by Shove et al. is related to other ideas and discussions about practices and their social, contextual and material features (e.g. Wenger 1998, 47; Reckwitz 2017, 115). For example, as discussed earlier, learning the shared practices of a community and identifying oneself as a *practitioner* can be significant for one's self-image. In doing so, one needs not only to possess the skills necessary to perform the practice, but also to be able to evaluate what is a good or appropriate way to perform the practice (Shove et al. 2012, 23). Shove et al. (2012, 23) call these skills *competences*, but there are other ways to describe this dimension of social practice. For example, Silvia Gherardi claims that practices involve *situated knowing*, which means that people who are engaging in the same practice 'know how to go on' with it (Gherardi 2015, 16). They have a sense of 'what is appropriate, what should be done next, when to act, and when something is correct or incorrect, effective or not, good and beautiful, or not' (Gherardi 2015, 16). This sort of *knowing* is not dependant on an individual's skills but on shared knowledge. It is a situated activity that people do together, and it is created through constantly negotiating the meanings of words, actions, situations and artefacts (Gherardi 2015, 16).[24] Bueger (Bueger 2017, 127) has pointed out that accounts of the components or elements of practice often include norms, but in his opinion there is 'little reason to isolate norms from other types of knowledge and turn them into independent elements'. He calls for a broader understanding of practical knowledge that also includes 'rules of thumb, body-based performances, or knowledge inscribed in artifacts' (Bueger 2017, 127).

Theories of practice have often focused on traditional 'social' phenomena (Shove et al. 2012, 8–9). According to Janine Morley, one the most significant changes that took place with respect to the practice turn was that many scholars began incorporating various material entities into their theories (Morley 2017, 81). As Gherardi points out, there are different ways of

[24] Gherardi uses the concept of *taste-making*, which is a process of negotiating the aesthetic criteria that support a community's ideas about what constitutes a 'good' or 'sloppy' practice, or a 'beautiful' or 'ugly' one. The taste-making process takes place within situated discursive practices (Gherardi 2012, 226).

identifying the elements of a practice, but as a rule they currently include *materiality* in one form or another (Gherardi 2017, 38). In fact, practice theorists generally agree with Andreas Reckwitz (2002, 221), who claims that 'the things handled in a social practice must be treated as necessary components for a practice to be "practiced"' (see also Schatzki 2002, 106). These ideas have been influenced by posthuman theories (Gherardi 2017, 37–39). As Gherardi (2017, 50) explains, a humanist approach to practices sees humans as sites of embodied understandings and analyses humans and their practices, whereas a posthumanist approach 'interrogates how all the elements within a practice hold together and acquire agency in being entangled'.

However, Janine Morley calls for a broader perspective on the *materiality* of practices. She points out that some forms of materiality can be important to practices without directly 'participating' in such practices as elements, and objects can be encountered in multiple ways beyond the mere 'enactment of social practices' (Morley 2017, 82–83; Rinkinen, Jalas, & Shove 2015, 1). She also points out that the category of *materials*, or *material elements*, is problematic because it refers to concrete and bounded physical entities, excluding certain aspects of the environment like air and water or sound or heat. In her opinion, the *relationships* and *interactions* between material entities should also be considered as part of the materiality of practices (Morley 2017, 83). Silvia Gherardi (2017, 39), who suggests using the concept *sociomateriality* as the 'glue' that connects all the elements of a practice, states that ethics and politics are also socio-material practices in the sense that they are linked to and have an effect on bodily and material practices (Gherardi 2017, 50).

The last of the three elements, as defined by Shove et al., is *meanings*. It is a very broad category that can refer to, for instance, 'general understandings' (Welch & Warde 2017), emotion and motivational knowledge (Reckwitz 2002, 249), or the social and symbolic significance of participation (Shove et al. 2012, 23). In their model, it is an equal component to the other two elements. As their example of driving a car shows, not only do new material elements and technology change the skills and competences required to drive a car, but the meanings related to the practice also affect the need to devise new technology: when driving became the practice of many, instead of a just leisure pursuit of the wealthy or 'mechanically-minded' persons, cars had to become more available and reliable (Shove et al. 2012, 26–31). Thus, the elements of a practice 'co-evolve' (Shove et al. 2012, 26–31).

CHANGE

For an ethnologist, the question of change is particularly interesting. Often, the meanings of practices — as traditions and customs — become more visible or are accentuated when they are about to be 'lost' (e.g. Article III, 41). This is especially true with 'transformative processes that take place gradually over longer periods of time' (Ekström 2020, 1). A change in a practice and its meaning usually also reflects a change in the surrounding culture and society (Stark 2009, 16). Radical innovations might lead to the destruction of old communities of practice and the emergence of new ones, and new practices might shift power from one group of people to another (Gherardi 2012, 220; Roberts 2006, 630; Stark 2009, 16).

As the title of the book *Dynamics of Social Practices* (Shove et al. 2012) suggests, practices always carry the possibility of change. According to the practice-as-elements model, when the connections between the three elements — materials, competences, and meanings — are sustained or broken, the practices either persist, shift or disappear (Shove et al. 2012, 1, 4). The reasons for sustaining or breaking the links, or relationships, between the elements vary. A change in practice sometimes originates from the appearance of new components, or from new ways of combining existing elements (Shove et al. 2012, 120). For example, appropriating new technologies, such as a biro pen, changed the meaning of writing with ink: 'using a fountain pen became an unusual rather than a normal thing to do' (Shove et al. 2012, 59). Replacing one component of a practice affects the relationships between the other components as well: technological innovations 'can undermine the value of established skills and knock rival artefacts and systems out of the way' (Shove et al. 2012, 59).

More often than not, change is not a result of deliberate actions that aim to discontinue the practice, but instead practices change gradually through the actions of all those who engage in them (Gherardi 2012, 219). First, because a practice can never be carried out in exactly the same way, each time a practice is performed it is a variation on the way it was done before. Thus, practices change simply by being practiced (Gherardi 2015, 21). Second, the core of a community of practice is the dynamic social structure of shared learning and meaning-making (Wenger 2010a, 180). The process of social learning is always present, and practices are excellent 'units of analysis' when studying 'how old and new knowledge can coexist in their constant tension and of how innovation can be a continuous process' (Gherardi 2012, 227–228).

According to Gherardi, there is an on-going debate within the field of practice studies as to whether practice should be seen as an object of change or an agent of change — with the former privileging the agency of humans and the latter the agency of practices (Gherardi 2017, 39). I agree with Gherardi, who claims that such dualism is fruitless (2017, 39), and believe that, depending on the situation, both perspectives can be justified. However, there are cases where practices are very clearly the object of change — or an object of dispute. For example, the management of an organisation might want to alter something in the firm's working practices or various working communities to increase collective knowledge within the organisation (Snyder & Wenger 2010, 111).[25] Corradi et al. (2010, 268) point out that researchers conducting organisational and managerial studies have appropriated the community of practice concept and aim to recognise and govern communities of practice within their organisations to better manage the adopting and distributing of new knowledge.[26] But, 'if communities of practice are born of the experience of doing, they cannot be willed into existence or designed from afar' (Shove et al. 2012, 68).

A top-down approach to changing the practices of a working community can often prove difficult, especially if no reciprocal trust exists between the social partners (Gherardi 2015, 19). Resistance to change often derives from *attachment*. For example, the pleasure one receives from carrying out a practice and sharing that pleasure with fellow practitioners can explain why a practice is reproduced and sustained (Gherardi 2015, 21). It also explains the

---

[25]For example, in her ethnological dissertations on culturally mixed crews on cargo ships, Anne Ala-Pöllänen observed that the crews are often consciously 're-shuffled' to transmit tacit knowledge concerning the ships and their machinery. However, whereas the shipping company felt that it was building more sustainable and socially functioning working communities by doing so, the crew viewed it as an undesired act of power (Ala-Pöllänen 2017, 118).

[26] This perspective on communities of practice as a strategy has also been introduced in museum studies (see Marty, Soren, & Armstrong 2013; Kelly & Gordon 2002), but it is not the perspective adopted in this study.

desire to prevent a change in working practices: the professionals care about the object of their work and their way of working, and they usually wish to 'affect what they do and the meaning of work in their life' (Gherardi 2015, 19). The continuity and history of the practice in question are also entry points for new members to a community: by contributing to its shared history, newcomers can also make it part of their own identities and become full members (Wenger 2010b, 136). This means that newcomers or younger generations of practitioners do not necessarily want to change the existing practice any more than established members do (Wenger 2010b, 136). Thus, change and continuity are entangled with the process of identity work and the meanings of practices

On the other hand, it should be noted that despite their attachment to a certain practice, practitioners do not necessarily want to preserve their practices unaltered. Practitioners can also deliberately change their practices themselves. Communities of practice are constantly elaborating the canons of community and (re-)negotiating the object, meanings and ethical and aesthetic criteria of the practice (Gherardi 2015a, 20–21).[27] Practices can be disputed even in a community where people share similar goals and values, and the tension is a driving force to 'refine the methods and meaning of the practice for those who derive identity from it' (Gherardi 2015a, 15, 21).

PROFESSIONAL MUSEUM CULTURE AS A FIELD OF PRACTICE

As mentioned before, the word *practice* can refer to an occupation, but it can also be used to mean a professional code or 'best practice'. However, *workplace practices* can include both official best practices and social and cultural everyday practices. When studying professional practices, or practices linked to a certain professional, institutional context, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between formal and informal practices (Tiili 2016, 15). In her

[27] This process could also be described as *cultural maintenance,* which could be explored through such metaphors as *tending* or *pruning* (Löfgren & Wilk 2006, 10).

doctoral dissertation on Finnish coast guards, ethnologist Miia-Leena Tiili uses the term practice in the sense of both formal and informal ways of doing and the choices that express cultural beliefs (Tiili 2016, 14). Tiili points out that the working life of Finnish coast guards is definitely structured by official rules and disregarding such rules in the analysis would produce interpretations divorced of context. On the other hand, a study that only focuses on the formal, official structures of professional coast guards might only replicate an understanding rising from the inner logic of the institution (Tiili 2016, 15). In the case of the museum field, professional ethics and other guidelines provided by governments or organisations like ICOM must affect the conduct of museum workers in some ways. Acknowledging the point does not mean, however, that museum workers would not construct other practices and have their own ideas and interpretations of what a museum is and what a museum professional does. As museum professionals might agree, the 'most distinctive, valuable knowledge in organisations is difficult or impossible to codify and is tightly associated with a professional's personal identity' (Snyder & Wenger 2010, 110).

According to Silvia Gherardi (2015, 20), the practice approach is 'born for illustrating the gap between formal description and prescription of work design and the situated working practices'. As Gherardi explains, a central theme in the study of working practices has been the 'hidden knowledge' — 'the pre-verbal, affective, corporeal, and nonrational knowledge' — that supports working practices (Gherardi 2015, 16; see also Corradi et al. 2010, 267). By negotiating the meanings of words, actions, situations and material artefacts at the workplace, people create the shared knowledge necessary for the work they do (Gherardi 2015, 19-20). Workplace practices also have a social dimension. As Snyder and Wenger point out, disseminating the 'hidden knowledge' of a workplace depends more on informal than formal learning: it depends on 'conversation, storytelling, mentorships, and lessons learned through experience' (Snyder and Wenger 2010, 110). In Paaskoski's opinion, the role of *socialisation* is significant for the professional group especially in professional fields where the route from education to employment is not straightforward (Paaskoski 2008, 11). It is conceivable that such would be the case also in work fields where there is no unified course of studies — like museums. People working in museums have various educational backgrounds and the work they carry out in a museum can vary greatly. Thus, the process of being socialised into the organisational or professional culture is important.

By carrying out shared practices and negotiating new meanings, people also create shared learning histories and a sense of community. As Wenger points out, the sense of being part of a tradition reinforces one's identity and turns the 'monotonous and meaningless aspects of the job - - into the rituals, customs, stories, events, dramas, and rhythms of community life' (Wenger 1998, 46). People who share the same workplace or profession 'participate in and contribute to a world that is socially and culturally structured and constantly reconstituted by the activities of all those who belong to it' (Gherardi 2015, 19).

In Conal McCarthy's words, *museum practice* 'refers to the broad range of professional work in museums, from the functions of management, collections, exhibitions, and programs to the varied activities that take place within these diverse and complex organizations, as well as indicating a recognizable sphere of work' (McCarthy 2015, xxxv). It often constitutes a 'best practice' by consisting of a 'clear set of rules of dos and don'ts: do wear gloves; don't allow board members to make management decisions; don't sell collections items; and so forth' (McCarthy 2015, xxxvii). It is this museum practice that is solidified in the official definitions and codes of ethics (McCarthy 2015, xxxvii, 2016, 24). But as McCarthy reminds us, we should 'be wary of definitions, codes, and laws, useful as they are for raising standards and monitoring performance', precisely because these 'artifacts of professionalism' restrict the practice and do not allow room for creativeness, change or varying views (McCarthy (2015, xxxvii). Museum professionals do not always agree on what the best museum practice should consist of and 'might even see the setting of standards, processes of accreditation, and other bureaucratic guidelines as exclusive boundaries that may stifle responsiveness to change' (McCarthy 2015, xxxvii).

In McCarthy's view, museum studies of the 21st century should strive to recognise the plurality of museum practices and also reflect on the inside views of practitioners. Instead of seeing professional practice as a set of established and officially described working methods, one should understand practice as a craft or skill, or simply as the things that people do (McCarthy 2015, xliii, xlv). As McCarthy stresses, the museum field needs standards and guidelines, but a broader understanding of museum practice(s) helps us to see how the everyday doings and sayings of a museum are not just codified activities 'but a constantly evolving, lived phenomenon' (McCarthy 2015, xlvi). Understanding museum work as a situated social practice 'brings a more diverse range of professional activities into view as important arenas of analysis' (McCarthy 2015, xlvi). Revealing the embodied actions, the meanings formed through doing and the performance of everyday work can 'make practitioners aware of aspects of their practice that they might have overlooked or deemed inconsequential' (McCarthy 2015, xlvii).

Choosing to study museum practices as social practices still leaves the choice of methods and perspectives open. One could treat the singled-out museum practices as empirical objects, chose one — such as documenting museum objects, guiding a tour or drawing up a fund development plan — and put it under the lens and examine its components. However, the result of this sort of descriptive analysis could be quite normative, and whether the knowledge achieved via this strategy is useful or not is another question. I believe one should rather understand the museum field as a field or nexus of practices, where knowing how to act is practical and situated knowing combines nonhuman objects, shared understandings and tastes to create a shared culture and serve as building material for identity construction. Adding an ethnological perspective to this setting means asking just how the people in the field experience all of it.

5. MEANINGFUL MUSEUM PRACTICES

COMMUNITIES AND IDENTITIES OF 'MUSEUM PEOPLE' – ARTICLE I

The main task of this study was to examine how ideas about museums are reflected in practices and how museum practices have been evaluated as more or less 'museal' in the Finnish museum field of the late 20th century. In 'Practice Makes "Museum People"' (Article I), I examined the relationship between *doing* and *being* a museum professional and studied the relationship between museum work practices and the identities of museum professionals through the concept of *communities of practice*. The empirical material consisted of ten interviews, carried out as part of the Finnish Museum History Project between 2005 and 2011. One of the interviewees was a man, while the other nine were women. They had all worked for the FHA or its institutional predecessor at some point in their career, and the interviews were archived either by the FMA or the FHA.

As mentioned earlier, while reading the interview transcriptions, I began to pay closer attention to the expression 'museum people'[28] and how it is loaded with various meanings — especially when the interlocutors did not identify with or feel themselves part of the community. In the material, the community of 'museum people' was usually defined by what they do, which was 'real museum work' (Article I, 142, 149). Drawing ideas from the practice theory framework, I decided to treat 'museum people' as a community of practice, defined by its shared, meaningful practices. Thus, I began to examine the content of those practices and why not everyone working in the museum

---

[28] In Finnish, *museoväki* or *museoihmiset*. In discussions with my fellow doctoral students, many of whom also worked in museums themselves, it was pointed out to me that these terms might have slightly different nuances: museoväki (Engl. museum folk) includes a larger pool of people — volunteers, amateurs, affiliates, and so forth — than museoihmiset (museum people) which usually refers to *museum professionals*. In my opinion, in the contexts where the former term is used in the interview material it refers to the professional museum field (Henna Sinisalo, email correspondence, 11.11.2020).

field is necessarily included in the community of 'museum people' (Article I, 142, 149). It became clear that the community of 'museum people' is mostly imaginary, but it still involves several practices through which people working in the museum field can feel connected to it. It was also clear that negotiating one's position in relation to the community of 'museum people' and to practices that are deemed more museal can be an important part of defining one's professional identity.[29]

Those who felt themselves a part of the community of museum people emphasised its positive aspects: a shared devotion and feeling of togetherness, and a 'discourse reflecting a certain perspective on the world' (Wenger 1998, 125–126; Article I, 144). Even when 'museum people' were not specifically mentioned, some interviewees described a strong community that worked together for a joint enterprise, sharing jargon and lore, and having a mutual understanding of the world (Wenger 1998, 125–126; Article I, 144). But the term 'museum people' was also used to mark borders and as a point of exclusion. Especially those who felt excluded from the community defined 'museum people' by their practices — 'proper museum work' — practices in which they themselves did not or could not participate (Article I, 145).

Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998, 2, 17–18) has suggested that 'ethnographic objects are objects of ethnography' because they have been created as such by ethnographers, 'by virtue of being defined, segmented, detached, and carried away by ethnographers', and therefore, ethnographic exhibitions always also display the ethnographic disciplines and practices. Applying the same logic, museum objects thus also always represent the museums and those who have handled, conserved and studied them in the museum and chosen them for display. But what sort of meaning do such objects have for those they represent?

According to Wenger, '[b]eing included in what matters is a requirement for being engaged in a community's practice' (1998, 74). For the interviewees, the 'things that mattered' included socialising with colleagues over a cup of coffee and discussing the substance of their work (Article I, 144). However, the

[29] Initially, I wanted to include the questionnaire material in the article since the material also mentions 'museum people': some museum enthusiasts who help maintain local heritage museums also identified as 'museum people'. However, the reviewers of the manuscript pointed out that I should narrow my scope, so the material was left out. Still, I find it noteworthy that according to the respondents, being counted as 'museum people' does not necessarily require professional training and is not connected to a professional status.

practices that interviewees most frequently mentioned as ‘real’ or ‘proper’ museum work had to do with arranging exhibitions or cataloguing museum objects. For those practices, the material element of museum collections was crucial (Article I, 148). The idea that studying and cataloguing museum objects is particularly museal work and constitutes ‘the ideal of museum intellectual activity’ exists also outside my empirical material (Sandino 2012, 94). Linda Sandino also suggests that through working in physical proximity with museum collections for a number of years, curators develop specific practical skills for handling the objects — what Sandino calls an ‘embodied curatorial eye’ (Sandindo 2012, 96). Orvar Löfgren has pointed out that the practice of ethnographic fieldwork was key to the formation of a modern ethnologist’s habitus. The fieldwork offered them a place for social learning and created a sense of craftsmanship and communal feelings — a ‘brotherhood’ of researchers (Löfgren 2014b, 119). Being allowed to use the tools of fieldwork, like cameras, was also important for constructing an ethnological fieldworker’s identity (Gustavsson 2014, 193; see also Carman 2006, 98). Similarly, one could say that museum professionals acquire their craftsmanship through socialisation and practical learning, and such a process requires museum objects (Article I, 149).

Many interviewees expressed frustration that the experience of doing ‘real museum work’ was being replaced by bureaucracy and other meaningless tasks, a sentiment echoed in the findings of other studies: Nieroba has noted that her interviewees’ everyday work was also inhibited by extensive bureaucracy’, and for them ‘administrative work often took precedence over work with actual museum content’ (Nieroba 2018, 4). Likewise, Reidla’s interviewees — curators and museum researchers — felt that their competencies were being underused and that their credibility as experts had suffered because they were denied authorship of exhibition concepts and the right to make decisions at museums (Reidla 2020, 374, 377–378).

It is clear that the work practices considered ‘proper museum work’ — usually handled by curators or conservators — are more highly valued, and people with roles and responsibilities differing from those practices yearn to be recognised as equally important members of the museum community (Article I, 147). Communities of practice are not necessarily homogeneous but can also contain tensions and conflicts, and workers can specialise and distinguish themselves from the group while still remaining members of the community (Wenger 1998, 75–77). The key to membership in the community of 'museum people' seems to be that others also recognise the importance of different practices and member roles (Article I, 146). Without the recognition of others, even shared practices receive a different meaning. For example, some interviewees criticised contemporary work culture for increasing managerialism and bureaucracy, which leads to neglecting the real museum work, but those more in the margins claimed that the more frequent general staff meetings provide a gateway to a larger community and serve as a unifying element (Article I, 147).

The style in which the interviewees imagined 'museum people' was often nostalgic, and it appears that the true 'museum people', those who are able to focus exclusively on proper museum work, were to be found in the past. The longing for the past, evident in the material, represents both *endo-nostalgia* — nostalgia for a past that one has experienced personally — as well as *exo-nostalgia* — a sense of losing something important, albeit not personally experienced (Berliner 2015, 21). On the other hand, for the contemporary communities of museum professionals, nostalgic discourse and talking about past community practices are meaningful ways of binding the community together in the present (Article I, 144–145). As Wenger points out, feeling part of a tradition reinforces one's identity and in work life context, turns the seemingly meaningless aspects of a job meaningful (Wenger 1998, 46; Article I, 149). The histories and traditions of a community of practice also act as an entry point for newcomers (Wenger 2010b, 135). If the newcomers, often representing younger generations, want to participate in the community as full members, they must gain access 'to the history they want to contribute to' and 'make it part of their own identities' (Wenger 2010b, 136). The shared exo-nostalgic discourse is another *museal* practice that strengthens the community and allows newcomers in.

In a work life context, a community of practice may connect individuals from various professions and institutions (Gherardi 2012, 221; Shove et al. 2012, 67; Wenger 2010b, 130–131). For example, Marty and Kim suggest that in the course of its history, the international Museum Computing Network (MCN) has formed a community of practice and that the socialising opportunities for its members over the years have transformed the network into an inspiring 'professional community of practice that transcends disciplinary, institutional, and national borders to solve the shared problems that arise from using technology in museums' (Marty & Kim 2020, 203–209). On the other hand, large organisational structures — such as the FHA or the National Museum of Finland — usually form a constellation of interconnected communities of practice that might still share common elements (Wenger 1998, 127).

The co-existence of different communities of practice within a single institution can be challenging. In her study of different exhibition production practices, Jana Reidla (2020, 375) pointed out that one of the curators she interviewed about working together with an external agency 'emphasized that working with their inhouse designer was different, as "he is part of us"'. Some of her other interviewees expressed similar attitudes when assuming that working with external designers would be problematic, 'as they are not interested in either content or context', whereas their inhouse designer 'is a "*museum-person* [emphasis added], who already knows what we do"' (Reidla 2020, 375). Reidla also observed a case where museum curators and hired external designers could not always understand each other because 'they seemed to speak different languages' (Reidla 2020, 377). Marty has also pointed out that hiring individuals based merely on their expertise in developing databases or designing web pages 'is a recipe for failure for most museums' because they do not understand 'the culture of the museum and its role as an information organization' (Marty 2006, 330).

On the other hand, communication between different in-house departments can be just as challenging when their 'plans and objectives' are too far apart (Reidla 2020, 373). Thus, belonging to a community of practice is not determined by a person's affiliation, education or title, but rather by their participation in the shared practices and the situated practical knowing. The dynamics inside and between different communities of practice can also clearly facilitate or hinder the work done in museums.

Jung has also found that the reasons for a lack of collaboration between different departments vary from museum to museum, but the 'tendency of museum exhibitions and programs failing to be developed in a cohesive and collaborative manner' is a common problem in the museum field throughout the world (Jung 2016, 168–169; see also Nieroba 2018, 4). As Jung points out, the tension between different in-house departments might stem from the different communities of practice, but their detachment from one another can be exacerbated by the physical division of office spaces, with barriers like key-card-protected doors separating them (Jung 2016, 168–169). While Shove et al. (2012, 132–134) do not consider physical space an element of practices, it clearly plays a role in how practices are carried out and how communities of practice take shape. Paul Jones and Suzanne MacLeod, for their part, conceive of the museum building as 'a dynamic space that is made meaningful through the interactions of space, objects, sociality, and the very meanings that flow from that interaction' (Jones & Macleod 2016, 208).

As the material of this study shows, the building of the National Museum of Finland blocked some of the flow of meanings: for some, the physical building signified links to other museum people — whether present or past — but it also created barriers between those working in the museum (Article I, 147). Ironically, the 'frontstage' of the museum — the exhibition rooms — became a 'backstage' space preventing the guards from having access to the planning and decision-making that took place in the offices and meeting rooms. One could argue that the community of 'museum people' uses a different practice space in the museum field. For them, the National Museum as a building constitutes a mutual history and connects them to previous generations within their community. For the others, not only what they do but also where they do it separates them from the 'museum people' (Article I, 149).

Curatorial agency has the power to 'make heritage' and select what is put on display and determine what individuals or groups are included or excluded from it (Gradén & O'Dell 2018a, 319; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998, 149–151). However, the practices of 'making the heritage' can also create discord amongst its practitioners. In my opinion, the concept community of practice best explains the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion in the museum field. The borders between different communities are created through practices, either by sharing them or preventing access to them. The 'museum people' as a community of practice is an analytical imaginary play constructed for the purposes of this study and it should not be understood as any concrete community 'out there'. The purpose of this study was not to decide who actually fit the definition of 'museum people', but to clarify how the dynamics of a community of practice affect the way people see their role in the museum field and their possible opportunities in the 'field of practices' (Shove et al. 2012, 65). Learning what is worth knowing, having a sense of when something is done correctly or incorrectly, being able to participate in the shared practices of a museum community and being acknowledged as a participant in those practices, and becoming 'a knower in a context where what it means to know is negotiated with respect to the regime of competence of a community' reinforces one's identity as a museum professional (Wenger 2010a, 181–182; Gherardi 2015, 16). However, the interview material also reveals that not all museum professionals are equal: there are those who are somehow closer to the core of what is *museal*, and they are defined by their practices.

DUSTING TO REVEAL THE 'RIGHT KIND OF MUSEUM' – ARTICLE II

In Article II, 'Dusty Museum', I examined practices related to ideas about the right kinds of museums using the analytical concept of *dust*: I followed the traces of museum dust to discover the relation of such an element to museum practices, the kinds of meanings it carries with it and the museum idea reflected in the practices of dust (Article II, 75).

The empirical motivation for the article arose from reading the responses to the 'My Museum Memories' questionnaire. Respondents clearly used the word 'dusty' to describe museums that did not please them, but the type of the museums they described as 'dusty' varied. I began to analyse what the respondents meant to say when calling a museum dusty, and why they had such a negative reaction to a dusty museum or dust in a museum. After establishing dust as my point of interest, I also wanted to find out if the museum professionals had anything to say about it in their interviews. Thus, in the second article I have combined the interview and questionnaire material, and it includes the perspectives of both museum professionals and museum visitors (Article II, 75). In the article, I make use of three interviews and seven responses to the questionnaire.

When analysing the material, I was inspired by Shove et al.'s practice-as-elements model. As discussed in Chapter 3, according to their view practices are a combination of three elements: materials, meanings and competences (Shove et al. 2012, 21–25). However, as a material element dust is slightly unorthodox or even *difficult*. Shove et al. suggest analysing the lifespan of elements and, for example, looking at how they evolve, where they come from and how material innovations affect the combination of elements in a practice (Shove et al. 2012, 15, 59). Dust, albeit a clearly material and tangible element, cannot be considered an innovation or a novelty; it does not change and it hardly has any rivals (Article II, 76). Dust does not have a history and it never fully disappears (Steedman 2002, 166). Nevertheless, it is a crucial part of many practices and inspires people to feel a certain way or take certain actions (Article II, 76). Acknowledging that dust does not exactly fit into the analytical model provided by Shove et al., I have examined what sort of a role it has in the material and discursive practices of museums, what sort of meanings it carries and what kind of effect it has on people.

As a material element, dust is present in, for example, the practices of collection management and planning an exhibition, where one has to consider protecting museum objects from dust. Removing dust from the exhibition rooms can be a time-consuming effort requiring much physical labour. The exhibition infrastructure, designed to prevent dust from being carried into the exhibition hall — such as protective glass cases or designed routes through the exhibition space —also impacts how museum visits are performed and experienced (Article II, 76–77; see also Shah et al. 2011, 26).

Sometimes dust has only an elusive role in the practices of museums, or it is the target of practices of removing dust. But in many cases, dust can be considered an active agent: the dustiness of the museum exhibition can affect the experiences of museum visitors. In the questionnaire material, the respondents often connected dust with disorder and dirtiness and observing dust in a museum made them feel uncomfortable. For some, the idea of dusty museums was so encompassing that it prevented them from going to museums at all (Article II, 77, 79). As Robert Willim has pointed out, dust is usually associated with inactivity and with things that are still, dull and out of date: for example, a dusty home is a lazy home where allergies and illness spread (Willim 2006, 55–59). Dustiness is despised because it represents disorder, a lack of care and low morals (Marder 2016, 8). Thus, when a museum is described as dusty it implies that the museum caretakers are failing to follow the standards of a properly maintained museum (Article II, 80).

However, dust in a museum can also have a positive effect on the museum experience by authenticating objects of history and creating a desired atmosphere in the museum (Article II, 79). In fact, dust can be considered actual material evidence of history: it is a 'residue of things', and it 'warrants a tangible and, indeed, spatial appearance of time' (Marder 2016, 6, 38). The belief that authentic and unique museum objects stir the most powerful reactions in museum visitors is central to 'museum lore' (Evans et al. 2002, 55; Bunce 2016, 230; Brenna, Christensen, & Hamran 2019, 1–2). Dust on an object proves that it has endured over time and is therefore an authentic historical object. It also adds an aura of mystery to the museum: a dusty museum room seems like it has remained untouched through time (Article II, 78).[30]

What was striking in the questionnaire material was how inconsistently the respondents referred to different kinds of museums as dusty. I believe that this reveals much about what kinds of museums the respondents considered 'right' or 'wrong'. A clear dichotomy existed between professionally maintained museums, usually a part of larger organisations and situated in urban areas, and local heritage museums, also known as *heimatmuseum* or *hembygdsgård* (Fin. *kotiseutumuseo*), which are centres displaying examples of local heritage and used as venues for festivities (Article II, 80; Heinonen 2010, 164–165; Salminen 2011, 94–96). The amateur staff at the local heritage museums often lacked training in handling historical objects, as well as in preservation and conservation methods, and they did not have the necessary funding. The museum professionals, who experienced a period of professionalisation in the late 20th century, did not want their work associated with the small, privately-owned museums (named as such by their owners), which they did not consider museums at all (Salminen 2011, 50). The underlying fear might have been that if some museums are viewed as dusty, in

[30] For an interesting discussion on the ethics of removing dust from museum objects, see Adrienne Gendron's presentation at the 2020 'Safety and Cultural Heritage Summit', where she discusses dust at the World Trade Center Memorial: in the 9/11 collection, dust represents a fundamental part of the object's history and museum value, and the dust also contains ashes of those people who died in the terrorist attack (Gendron 2020).

the sense of being old-fashioned, the whole museum field will be generalised as such (Heinonen & Lahti 2001, 216, 218–219; Article II, 82–83).

Thus, dust is also an element in discursive practices related to museums. In discourse, dust can be used to create social order by describing perceived 'backwardness' and 'uncivilised' peoples in general as dirty or dusty (Fine & Hallett 2002, 11–12; Shove 2003, 88). As the material presented in this study shows, dustiness, in the sense of backwardness and anti-progressiveness, is an attribute that is projected onto the *other*. The *dustiness* of the material could then refer to the rigidity and stagnation of professional museum institutions and to the 'dead' objects lying in glass display cases, whereas the respondents often viewed local heritage museums as more authentic, alive and dynamic — or then, at other times, to the peripheral, local museums that are disorderly and lacking in competence (Article II, 80, 82–83).

Willim (2006, 55) has pointed out that dust is made visible by activity, and it should therefore rather be associated with speed and movement. Indeed, as a verb dust or dusting means an activity where one removes dust from surfaces. According to Michael Marder, removing the sediment that covers artefacts reveals the 'real' objects, and dusting is a way to 'get reacquainted with them' (Marder 2016, 2, 14, 83). *Dusting* as an allegory and discursive practice means re-examining an object — or an abstract idea, thought or concept — and removing some of the prejudices and misconceptions that have been attached to it over time. In museum discourse, the term is connected to reforms and introspection and signifies change (Article II, 84).

One example of dusting museums was the FMA's 1986 marketing campaign 'Museums are not dusty — ideas might be', which several of the interviewees mentioned. The campaign was targeted at the political and economic decision-makers, and the aim was to make them commit to a more museum-positive attitude. The campaign was the subject of some debate in the museum field: it was deemed costly and relying on commercial advertising was seen as 'selling out'. However, the marketing campaign did manage to point out the fact that it was the views of the 'wider audience' that needed updating, while at the same time updating museums by introducing marketing as a new practice for museums (Article II, 84).

The 1980s and 1990s were a time when museums worldwide faced strong economic pressure and the commodification of 'museum products' and finding new audiences through marketing became more popular topics in international museum literature (Hieta, 2010, 52–56; Harrison 2005, 46; Rentschler 2007, 15–16; Reidla 2020, 369—370; Ekström 2020, 8). FMA also organised its first course on marketing for museum professionals in 1987 (Kinanen 2010, 88). Though the new marketing and managerial practices met with much resistance, they have slowly been accepted in Finnish museums (Levanto 2010, 106). Adopting marketing as a museum practice effectively changed the way museums and their roles in society are understood and indicates a shift from 'object-based' to 'people-based' museums (Rentschler 2007, 13).

It is interesting to ponder how the notion of a *dusty museum* has changed since museums entered the experience or tourism economy. As Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett has pointed out (1998, 139), for some time now the presumption has been 'that visitors are no longer interested in the quiet contemplation of objects in a cathedral of culture' but want instead to have 'an experience', and museums might worry that they are being 'bypassed as boring, dusty places, as spaces of death'. Becoming too professional can, in fact, alienate and detach museums from their users (Gradén & O'Dell 2016, 57). Thus, professionally maintained museums might have something to learn from the community based local heritage museums. However, trying to reinvigorate museums as more engaging or adopting a 'hip heritage' strategy (e.g., Gradén & O'Dell 2018c, 46) is risky as well, since many museum visitors can also be rather conservative in their expectations — about the museum's content and message (Smith 2021, 3) or its form.

In any case, the idea of a dusty, old-fashioned, stagnated museum is difficult to overcome. Even after thorough dusting, the dust will begin to resurface (Article II, 85). In 1991, Julian Spalding (1991, 165) wrote that museums are associated with death and dust: 'No matter how bright and lively museum become (as many now have) the image in the public's mind remains on of dust, silence and sepulchral gloom'. In 2007, Mari Hatakka (2007, 85) noted that in Finnish colloquial language the word *museum* often also stands for something 'dusty, isolated, forgotten', belonging in the past, whereas Susanna Pettersson (2019, 9) has commented on the lack of recognition of the museum profession by saying that the 'dust metaphors' concerning the field are painfully common. She also claims that the dust is swept away by 'acting and not complaining', and museum professionals need to start believing in their professional competences, be more ambitious and, if necessary, change their practices (Pettersson 2019, 9–10).

As an element of museum practices, dust can play many roles. It is present in planning, maintaining and visiting an exhibition and in creating an 'authentic' atmosphere. Dust is clearly a material, tangible element, one that directly or indirectly affects the people engaged in carrying out museum practices. However, in retrospect dust does not always quite equate with the material elements described by Shove et al. (2012). As discussed in Chapter 3, one should not limit the analysis of material elements only to concrete physical entities but should instead also consider the *sociomateriality* of objects and observe how ethics and politics are linked to material practices — or vice versa (Morley 2017, 83; Gherardi 2017, 50). Material museum dust is also linked to meanings and moral values that become visible through certain expressions. The ways of dealing with dust in museums are linked to certain meanings and competences, such as good organisation skills, professional knowledge and a high level of morality (Article II, 86). A *dusty museum* and *dusting a museum* are immaterial concepts that are still connected to the tangible dust in a museum. These discursive practices are tied to museum politics and can be used to create social order and 'other' the 'wrong' kind of museums (Fine & Hallett 2002, 11–12). Depending on the context, they can have slightly different meanings. The use of the term *dusty museum* reveals the ideological preferences of the interlocutor: whether strictly professional museums committed to academic research, or more freely defined, 'live' local heritage museums (Article II, 86).[31]

[31] It was pointed out to me by a fellow PhD student after the article had been published that these discursive practices and the ideal of a dustless museum can be quite harmful to the museum profession: the shame associated with unsuitable, dusty storage facilities can prevent people from speaking about them publicly, meaning the scale of the problem remains hidden (Henna Sinisalo, email correspondence, 11.11.2020).

THE ‘REAL MUSEUM WORK’ – ARTICLE III

The third research article further explores the subject of change, which was already touched upon in Article II, and looks more closely at the practice of ‘real museum work’ mentioned in Article I. In Article III, ‘“Real Museum Work” and Information Technology – Does not Compute!’, I examined more closely what happens when something in the practices that are considered *museal* begin to change. This is illuminated through the example of what was defined as ‘real museum work’ in the interviews and the changes that such work faced in the late 20th century. The empirical concept of ‘real museum work’ is treated as a social practice, defined by certain material elements, competences and shared meanings and which can be done either correctly or incorrectly. It includes specific know-how, bodily and mental activities, and ways of understanding the world (or museums). In the article, I study how museum work has been affected by new material elements introduced by the emergence of information technology. The central research question is twofold: How is ‘real museum work’ understood and defined by museum professionals, and how does information technology relate to it? (Article III, 36, 38–39.)

The initial motivation for the article arose — once again — from my reading of the material. When writing the first article about ‘museum people’ and their practices, I had already noticed that ‘real museum work’ was another value-laden term used by the interviewees. Their definitions of real museum work and how it differs from other types of work done in a museum followed common narratives in the museum field, but it also raised some important questions. Working on computers has become part of everyday life in museums, and the changing uses of technology has become part of museum history, too: As Mike Jones (2021, 2) points out, ‘the first experiments in automating collections documentation took place nearly 60 years ago’, and when the ‘Smithsonian closed on 14 March 2020 [due to the global Coronavirus pandemic] their website was only a few weeks shy of its 25th anniversary’. Still, the interviewees did not consider computer work ‘real museum work’ in the same way as other tasks related to museum collections.

I decided to focus on the tensions between information technology and the concept of 'real museum work', which also reflects ideas about museums in general (Article III, 38).[32]

The material used in the article consists of nine interviews with museum professionals,[33] selected through a preliminary thematic analysis, short articles published in *Museopolitiikka* (Museum politics), a journal published between the years 1982 and 1993 by *Museopoliittinen yhdistys* (Society of Museum Politics), and the autobiography of Tuula Arkio (2015), a former director of the Museum of Contemporary Art Kiasma and the FNG. While the interview material is the central focus of the analysis, I found the other sources useful for presenting a broader picture. Such a combination can be described as a bricolage of material and methods (e.g. Ehn 2014, 61–62; Article III, 41). All nine interviewees were women, which challenges the common stereotype that technology is a male-dominant field (see, e.g. Suominen 2003, 118). As the article shows, in the museum field women were competent when it came to computers and also actively and publicly promoted the use of information technology (Article III, 53).

The interviewers, though, never specifically addressed the topics of computers or information technology. This could be understood as an act of framing something out of a discussion so that the issue is never considered, even though it was likely not intentional. It also means that material dealing with the computerisation of museums is admittedly scarce. When the topics were discussed, the interviewees did so rather spontaneously and as part of discussing museum work in general, which in my view challenges the interviewers' views of excluding information technology from museum history.

Digitalisation has been called one of the 'epochal changes' that has reshaped the ways in which 'cultural heritage is made, held, collected, curated and exhibited or simply exists' (Borowiecki et al. 2016, xx; Article III, 40). The shared history of museums and information and digital technology spans more than four decades (Chapman 2015, 189). Still, the history of museum computing has not been given the same academic scrutiny as the rest 'of our

[32] In this study, the term *information technology* is used as a hypernym covering a variety of virtual and digital tools that usually materialise in the form of a *computer*.

[33] All the interviewees began their careers in the museum field in the 1960s or early 1970s, and they worked in national museum organisations. Thus, this sample does not represent the whole Finnish museum field, and the experiences of those working in smaller museums may have been different.

curatorial and museographical past' (Parry 2007, 6–8; see also Ekosaari 2008, 1–2).[34] According to Ross Parry (2010a, 5, 2010b, 12), the discourse on technology has usually been fixated on the 'culture of now' and neglected the past that has led to the technological innovations and new digital practices.

If one considers innovation as a continuous process driven by changes in social practices, it is difficult to pin down the exact point in history when digitalisation began (e.g. Gherardi 2012, 227–228). However, one starting point for the global process of computerisation is the 1970s, when the 'technological system, in which we are fully immersed at the dawn of the twentieth century, came together' and the whole 'information technology revolution' started (Castells 2010, 53–54). The new technological innovations, the microprocessor and microcomputer, made information technology also available for commercial use, and the 1980s saw 'the Personal Computer Revolution' (Marty & Kim 2020, 201; see also Castells 2010, 53–54). This was followed by the digitalisation of society in the 21st century, which changed the nature of global relationships and also put more pressure on museums to be more inclusive and use different platforms to communicate with their audiences (Borowiecki et al. 2016, xix–xx). The international museum field has been following the developments and possibilities of the new technologies from the beginning: The Museum Computer Network was established in 1967 and held its first annual conference in New York in 1968 (Marty & Kim 2020, 193). In Finland, computers first entered museums in the 1970s and 1980s (Ekosaari 2008, 4).

The interviewees, for their part, most clearly defined 'museum work' through negation: it was not doing bureaucratic paperwork and not sitting in on meetings or having anything to do with a consultant, which most considered a waste of time. In several cases, interviewees described 'real' or 'proper' museum work as building exhibitions or cataloguing museum objects, but for one reason or another most did not participate in such activities themselves: either they could not find the time for it because they had to do

[34] There are always exceptions. In the Finnish context, Asko Mäkelä (2005) has introduced the main timelines and challenges of early digitisation projects in Finnish museums, while Maija Ekosaari (2008) has studied the use of information technology in Finnish art museums in her master's thesis. Bodil Axelsson (2019) has recounted how Swedish cultural history museums adopted digital collection databases and created their digital curatorial agency, and Malcolm Chapman (2015) has written an overview of the evolution of museum collection management systems in the English-speaking museum field.

other tasks, or they were not in a position to do so (Article III, 42). According to Jana Reidla, who interviewed curators from the National Museum of Finland in the 2010s, her interviewees also complained that scientific research on the collections could only be conducted when there was extra time or when the research was needed for an exhibition, and this trend had 'gradually been introduced into everyday practice' over the last few decades (Reidla 2018, 126; see also Nieroba 2018, 5).

According to Robbins, in the field of conservation one often hears the expression 'to have something at your fingertips', which means 'that you have professionally reached a point where the knowledge that you have read and learned has been transferred to your fingertips - - becoming part of the almost automatic gut-feeling experience that guides your sharp scalpel' (Robbins 2020, 66–67). The material suggests that 'real museum work' is also strongly based on the material element of museum collections and seems a rather bodily action: it is done 'by hand' and involves *Fingerspitzengefühl* — specific practical know-how (Article III, 43–44). This includes not only handling the museum objects with a trained, 'embodied eye' (Sandindo 2012, 96), but also maintaining order in the collections. Before digital systems, the order of museum collections often relied on the proximity of items in the storage room, and when they needed to be interrogated 'a curator was not at a desk looking at a screen, or in front of a filing cabinet, but instead was physically moving within that collection' (Parry 2007, 35–36). For a long time, the collections of the National Museum of Finland were also located inside the building and at other nearby locations, easily accessible for curators. Doing an inventory of the collections and familiarising oneself with them was a sort of rite of passage into the field of museum work and the working community (Article III, 43).[35]

What the interviewees defined as 'real museum work' requires certain competences. Especially in the interviews with museum curators, they frequently discussed the 'expert knowledge' of museum professionals. Mastering the substance-related knowledge of managing collections made the job meaningful, and true experts did not need technical devices to process their knowledge (article III, 44). In essence, 'real museum work' can be

[35] As Reidla points out, nowadays the curators of the National Museum of Finland are not responsible for physically maintaining the museum collections, whereas their colleagues in other Baltic National Museums — and other Finnish museums — may still assume such responsibilities (Reidla 2018, 126).

understood as actions related to the material museum collections that require situated knowing, expert competences and intellectual and embodied skills.[36]

However, 'real museum work' that depends so much on individual museum professionals is not sustainable in the long run (Article III, 45). Reidla talks about 'generational specialisation', meaning that those who have worked longer in the museum have gained more knowledge about the collections because 'they were working with them when the tradition of studying collections was still viable' and because they have done plenty of groundwork for exhibitions and catalogues. This generation has started to retire, giving rise to a fear of losing invaluable knowledge about the collections (Reidla 2018, 129). The physical handling of objects, though, has also posed risks for the collections in general (Article III, 46). Index files were one way of democratising and sharing information about the collections, rather than relying on curators to commit important facts to memory. Still, keeping up-to-date records on the objects with all necessary accompanying information was nearly impossible. Moreover, a card-based cataloguing system required more manual work and can only order the collections in one particular way (Parry 2007, 105; Ekosaari 2008, 24–25; Williams 2010, 15). There was a justifiable need to improve the cataloguing systems in museums.

In Finland, in the 1980s the use of personal computers increased rapidly both at home and in the office, but from the point of view of a single user the process might have occurred differently and not simultaneously (Suominen 2003, 226; Saarikoski 2004, 184). In museums, workers also faced increased pressure to advance the computerisation of museum work. The shift to using computers happened gradually, and different organisations, offices and individuals adopted computers independently from one another and at different stages (Article III, 50; see also Ekosaari 2008, 15). Municipal museums were introduced to computers through financial administration, and in the NHA some offices were 'forced' to obtain computers. In some museums, employees decided independently to bring their own equipment to work (Article III, 48). When computers started to appear in museums more and more frequently, the museum field had to address the issue (Heinonen

[36] In comparison, Ala-Pöllänen's study of the mixed crews on cargo ships found that relying on routines and practical knowledge risked the safety of the whole ship: properly utilized, routines can increase safety, but blindly relying on assumptions based on previous events can also lead to miscommunication (Ala-Pöllänen 2017, 165).

1984, 21). In the early 1980s, information technology was a common topic in the journal *Museopolitiikka*, and it was seen as the best solution for developing cataloguing systems and resolving the problems of keeping collections in order. The writings in *Museopolitiikka* indicate that IT-based records were seen as more organised and free of the burden of older traditions (Article III, 48–49). Still, Simmons (2015, 225) has noted that when computer systems first became affordable for most museums, the 'existing eccentric and specialized manual systems were converted to eccentric and specialized electronic systems, reflecting the organizational and occasionally non-rational ideas of the registrars and curators who drove the system design'.

The use of unified standards for cataloguing museum objects might have been introduced also without information technology, but in museological discourse the 'twin innovations of automatisation and standardisation' are often associated with one another (Parry 2007, 30, 49; Article III, 47). The use of computers and information technology met with some resistance: there were concerns that the unified digital cataloguing system was too restricting and undermined the unique expert knowledge of the curators. The new cataloguing systems did indeed introduce new hierarchies and vocabulary to the cataloguing process. In the beginning, new computer program manuals were also used as cataloguing guidelines, and the features of the program determined how objects were described and documented (Ekosaari 2008, 75). Ekosaari (2008, 48–49) has wondered whether some of the resistance to the cataloguing standards arose from the humanistic tradition and linguistically gifted curators, who wanted to define and use their own terms and concepts. Parry has also pointed out that often the cataloguing programs were designed by experts with backgrounds in the 'hard sciences', for whom adopting a categorising system similar to the Linnaean taxonomy was logical. Thus, the clash between the old and new ways of cataloguing museum objects was perhaps partly also a clash between humanistic and scientific ways of arranging knowledge (Parry 2007, 42–43, 45).

Reidla has noted that the Estonian research curators she interviewed for her study were also critical of the information systems used in museums, possibly because development of the All-Estonian system was 'ragged due to different technical errors, incomplete dictionaries, and the generally poor IT level at the museums' and this has caused 'exhaustion from the endless motion and prejudice about the efficient operation of the system' (Reidla 2018, 123). The comment by one of her interviewees that entering data into the system constituted a waste of 'her valuable time as a specialist with a scientific degree' is in line with findings of my own study (Reidla 2018, 123). Many viewed the new IT jargon as a threat to 'real museum work' and the embodied and tacit knowledge related to it, and many museum professionals were perhaps also concerned about their status in the museum field: the emergence of computers and information technology created new professions, but it did not increase employment in the traditionally museal sectors. Instead, museums hired information scientists and computer programmers (Article III, 55–56).

As Marty and Kim (2020, 201) point out, the 'information technologies that support the collecting and sharing of collections data in museums - - are themselves a force of change'. Shove et al. (2012, 58–59) claim that the emergence and disappearance of elements of a practice are interrelated, and that technological innovations and the adoption of new elements may 'undermine the value of established skills and knock rival artefacts and systems out of the way'. When, for example, the material elements of a practice change, the relationships between the other elements also change accordingly. This is visible in the way 'real museum work' changed. Since the new cataloguing programs required a new set of skills and competences, the curators' previous skills did lose some of their value and meaning (Article III, 56). According to Parry, the 'free-playing and expressive world of individual curatorship' was lost in order to 'fit into the new standardised systems and data models that first accompanied museum computing' (Parry 2007, 47, Parry 2010a, 2).

Information technology and standardised cataloguing programs affected the material (and physical) elements and competences related to 'real museum work'. The most visible change to the practice was the appearance of computers: they changed how the work was carried out and how people interacted with each other in the office and in the wider museum field (Article III, 56). They changed the relationship between curators and their collections: instead of having a physical connection to museum objects and index files, curators were handling a computer mouse and the computer handled the information (Article III, 50, 53). Digital networks brought the world together but also created distance between curators and museum objects.

Communities of practice are born of the shared experience of doing and practicing together and trying to change certain dynamics or elements of such communities not only change the practice but also the meaning of identifying as a *practitioner*, and the *situated knowing* that is the product of a long, shared process (Shove et al. 2012, 68; Gherardi 2015, 16). What is more, the resistance to changes can derive from attachment to the practice or act of practicing. Museum professionals care about the substance of their work and their way of working, which also represents a shared history of learning, and it is natural they should wish to 'affect what they do and the meaning of work in their life' (Gherardi 2015, 19). If learning the required competences and identifying oneself as a practitioner of 'real museum work' are significant for one's self-image, it is understandable that top-down approaches to overseeing the way in which museum work is done will cause tensions.

On the other hand, despite their attachment to certain practices and need for continuity, practitioners can also deliberately want change and refine their practices. As Gherardi suggests, communities of practice are constantly re-negotiating the object, the meanings and the ethical and aesthetic criteria of their practices (Gherardi 2015a, 20–21). Jim Angus (2012, 38) has pointed out that technical innovations are 'no stranger to museums'. Museums have had to develop their own systems and methods for categorising, organising, preserving and restoring their objects, and museum specialists have learned how to physically position and spotlight objects properly for viewing purposes and how to provide other material to help viewers interpret them – having once done it for the first time and then learning from their mistakes (Angus, 2012, 38). The automatisation and standardisation of museum cataloguing also arose from the museum professionals' own desire to improve their cataloguing practices and systems, and so they have not been entirely divorced from previous practices. Similar to other practices, working with computers and digital tools is a skill that has to be learned, adopted and adjusted in practice. As Marty claims, few museum professionals begin their jobs with all the skills they will need, and, for example, people who use information technology in museums need to develop *information literacy skills* specific to the needs of museums (Marty 2006, 328, 330; 2007, 98).

Museum work practices changed a great deal in the late 20th century, and for the 'nomads' of the twenty-first century who were employed in digitalising projects, museum work has looked quite different than it did for those who entered the museum field before computerisation had begun. Still, the act of managing digital collections and 'actual' collections is rather similar and requires acquiring, storing, conserving, keeping secure, making accessible and displaying the objects (Keene 2011, 42–43). As Marty and Kim (2020, 193–194) point out, the environment of museum computing has changed since the 1960s, but while the technologies used in museums 'have changed dramatically from the terminal/mainframe systems of the 1960s', the goals and aspirations of museum professionals working with them have remained surprisingly similar.[37] In analysing the history of the Museum Computing Network conferences over the last 50 years, they found 'that as a group, we have long been concerned about our messages, our visitors, and our information resources; we are still trying to document our collections, reach our audiences, and connect people with information through technology' (Marty & Kim 2020, 194).

However different the practices of the 1970s and 2020s may look, it seems that two things remain constant: the importance of museum objects and the people who work with them. Despite the computer programs and standardisation attempts, museums still have their own traditions, and only people 'can make a computer perform so as to accomplish the needs of museums' (Chenhall & Vance 2010, 39; Article III, 57).

[37] For a detailed description of how the materiality of the practice of documentation has changed in museums following changes in documentation technologies, see Olsrud 2019.

6. CONCLUSIONS

> I can still almost viscerally feel the excitement that I first felt on being able to go from the front-stage of the Museum displays through doors, often hidden at the back of galleries, into what initially seems to be a maze of footfall-echoey staircases and doors to mysterious offices. I liked having my own key to be able to use these doors, and being able to move, unchallenged by the security warders who manned the boundary, from visitor space to curator space. However, although the Museum retained its magic for me and although I continue to find the workings of museums fascinating, much of the day-to-day activity in that world behind scenes was familiar and even mundane office life: writing (mostly at computers), reading, 'shuffling paper' (as routine administration is referred to), making telephone calls, photocopying, picking up and sending faxes, having coffee, holding meetings, chatting, and leaving and arriving for other meetings or conferences, or perhaps for a spot of shopping. Much of this, and its everyday tribulations and celebrations — someone going off sick, the photocopier breaking down, misplacing an urgently needed file, a promotion, a birthday, a piece accepted for publication — was very much like the routine academic milieu. (Macdonald 2002, 10)

The main task of this dissertation was to assess how museums are practiced and defined through practices. The guiding idea has been to dodge the official descriptions of museums or museum professionals and analyse how they are perceived in action. This has been done in the three included research articles, in which I have discussed how some people, work tasks and museums have been valued as more or less 'museal' than others in the Finnish museum field of the late 20th century. The three cases are interconnected: the 'right kind of museum' is produced through a set of practices that are considered 'museal', and carrying out these practices is important for the professional identity of those working in museums.

Working with the analytical concepts of community of practice, elements of practice and change in practice has been an experiment and a way to explore the different dimensions of museum practices. As discussed in Chapter 4, the word *practice* and its derivatives can have many meanings in colloquial and academic languages. Sometimes during my analysis process, I have felt that I may have taken on too much of a challenge by choosing to rely on the practice theory framework and that the concept of practice, with all its theoretical baggage, was too weighty. But in the end, I have come to realise that all the different associations we have with the concept also allow for and suggest different perspectives for the analysis. In the title of this dissertation, I opted to use the form *practicing,* which according to dictionaries can be defined as being actively involved in a job or 'following the rules, especially of a religion' (*Cambridge Dictionary* 2021). *Practicing museums* is not the same as practicing a religion or witchcraft, but it does involve following certain rules and traditions accepted by the community, and it also includes certain values, norms and ideals. At the same time, it hints at repetition, learning and change, and the uncertainty of never really knowing exactly what form museums should and will take.

A *practice* can mean something that is usually done as a habit or a custom, or something that is done regularly, maybe in order to improve your skills and become more proficient (McCarthy 2015, xlv). Practicing, which by definition is a shared activity, also has social significance: it involves *practitioners* — those who share the same practices, who know how to interpret them and who can judge their correctness — and practicing together creates a shared history of the practice (Wenger 1998, 46; Gherardi 2015, 16, 19). Carrying out a set of shared practices has meaning for the community, and museum professionals can form an attachment to their working practices or ways of practicing together (Gherardi 2015, 19). As Wenger (2010a, 181–182) points out, learning a practice is also becoming 'a knower' in a context where 'what it means to know is negotiated with respect to the regime of competence of a community'. A relationship exists between 'doing a museum' and being a museum professional, and the practices that define the right kind of museum also define the right kind of museum professionalism.

Practicing museums involves a craft, and there is hidden, tacit knowledge in the museum field that can only be learned and transmitted *in practice* as opposed to through book learning. Though museum work has become more standardised, democratised and professionalised in various ways over the years, I believe museum professionals also value their situated, practical knowledge. It is the mark of being associated with 'museum people' — of being a true museum professional — and for the uninitiated, the situated knowledge regarding museum work is not always understandable.

Practice also stands in opposition to theory: it is action rather than ideas, and when something happens *in practice*, it means something that *actually* happens as opposed to what you might think will happen (e.g. Corradi et al. 2010, 279, note 1). *In theory,* the museum field has embraced the ideas of new museology, but *in practice* museum professionals might combine elements from the new philosophy and their institution's former traditions (Nieroba 2018, 7). *In theory,* a museum 'acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment' (ICOM 2007), but what takes place in museums *in practice* can be rather unceremonious: writing, reading, 'shuffling paper', making telephone calls, photocopying, having coffee, sitting in meetings and chatting (Macdonald 2002, 10).

As one of my research questions I asked what a museum definition looks like when studied through the practices of individuals associated with museums. The simple — and rather predictable — answer is that when viewed as a cultural concept, there is no *one* definition for a museum. However, visible patterns emerged in the material: the ideal or 'right kind of museum' is produced through, for example, practices that aim to remove or prevent dust — in a concrete or metaphorical sense. A 'dusty museum' is perceived as unprofessional, disorderly and below standard; it is also old-fashioned and out of date, and the term is used to create social order. Thus, correspondingly the proper and professional museum should remain dynamic in order to prevent any dust from gathering and adopt new customs and operations as museum practices.

Sometimes the values and ideals that are intertwined with practices become more visible in a time of change. The new museum practices, such as marketing or digital cataloguing, are particularly interesting because they demonstrate change in museum views. The changes in museum practices both affect and reflect the ways in which museums are defined. They are a continuation of past practices and yet represent something completely new, and for the museum professionals such changes have renewed their working environments and altered their ways of working and being in museums.

Changes in the professional museum field have sometimes been met with resistance or even hostility, but then once the new customs are accepted as museum practices, they often have much to offer. Marty and Kim (2020, 210) have suggested that over the years, the international Museum Computing Network has formed a community of practice bringing together educators, collection managers, curators, social media and digital content educators and museum administrators from around the world. In their opinion, because the field of museum computing is constantly evolving, 'it is not easy for museum technology professionals to navigate the changing world of information and communication technologies in museums on their own' (Marty & Kim 2020, 212). During its history, the MCN has faced economic crises and suffered a loss of members, but it has survived by being a community of practice: 'by supporting each other through hard times, and by informing, engaging, and inspiring each other to find shared solutions to common problems' (Marty & Kim 2020, 212). Thus, the changes in practices and technological innovations — such as information technology and standardised cataloguing practices — that have imposed threats to the traditional 'real' museum work can also give birth to new communities of practice in the museum field. On the other hand, in order to survive innovations also need the social dimensions of practices — a community — around them.

The question that gained more value in my mind as my research progressed was: what are the practices that define a museum? Furthermore, whose practices define it? If carrying out 'proper' museum practices defines a museum professional, then does all work done by a museum professional constitute museum practice? If museums are interpreted as spaces and institutions, the meanings of which are created through social practices, then any practice could be a museum practice. Seeing some practices as more 'museal' than others is therefore a statement about what should take place in a museum and what a museum should be. However, *in practice* the mundane office practices described in Sharon Macdonald's (2002) book can also carry significance and be gateways or barriers to a community in the museum field. Museums do have an air of the extraordinary around them and being allowed backstage for the first time can be a thrilling experience. But as a workplace and a working community, a museum is produced through any shared practices that the in-house communities value.

This dissertation has its limitations due to its setting. The archived questionnaire and interview material must be studied in their original context, and though they can tell a wider story, in the end they still only give insight into the experiences of a few individuals. The interview material does not represent all the different occupations in the museum field; it emphasises instead the role of curators and directors of larger organisational structures. As Norton-Westbrook has pointed out, variances in circumstances do have an impact on the duties and responsibilities of museum professionals, which in turn contribute to the formation of their ideas, beliefs and sense of identity (Norton-Westbrook 2015, 349). Smaller or local museums are in a different position than national museums: even if there is no lack of skills, there might be insufficient budgets or facilities, which prevent museum workers from doing what they would want to do in theory.

The interview material also tells us about the shared experiences of a generation that has by now left the museum, and the circumstances for those who entered the museum field in the 2000s have changed: digital tools have become part of their everyday life and the emphasis on communication and community involvement is widely accepted. The younger generations' ideas about the proper way to do things might — and probably does — look different. It would be interesting to know what sort of a role the practices of past generations play in their lives: is the lore of museum people and real museum work a gateway to a community for them, or are there other practices that reinforce their identities as museum professionals?

The settings of this research project have also prevented me from documenting all pertinent information. Plenty of changes occurred in the Finnish museum field of the 20th century that could not be addressed in the articles. One such change was the museums' growing emphasis on education and communication and the emergence of the new profession of museum educators. The relationship between museum pedagogy and 'real museum work' would also deserve more examination.

McCarthy has called for an approach in museum studies that acknowledges the plurality of views and the plurality of museum practices (McCarthy 2015, xliii–xlv). This study represents some of them and recognises that there are many communities (of practice) in the museum field, born from different circumstances and the ways of belonging to them, and the collaboration between them do not always occur in a straightforward manner. As Bueger (2017, 131) reminds us, we should not strive to conduct 'confirmatory research' but 'be open to surprise and the actual messiness of practice'. Museums are the product of social practices that change with time and vary in different societies and communities, and understanding this fact allows us to examine more critically where our different ideas about museums.

When thinking in terms of a metamuseum (Bal 1992), the layers of different museum practices are always more or less visible in museums, but they are not always understandable. The past practices of cataloguing, exhibiting and guiding are part of museum history and worthy of documentation, but they need contextualisation. They represent changing museum views and museum politics, but they are also social practices that have had personal and shared meanings for the people who carried them out. Perhaps such practices represented a certain culmination of museum professionalism, perhaps they have been faced with prejudice and doubt. Showing that museums are filled with people and life — instead of 'silent' objects and dust — could only make the world of museums more interesting.

REFERENCES

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

INTERVIEWS

Finnish Heritage Agency, Helsinki, Finland
Ethnological Archives: Museum History Project
Interviews carried out in 2007, 2008, 2010 and 2011.

Finnish Museums Association, Helsinki, Finland
Archives: Museum History Project
Interviews carried out in 2008 and 2009.

Finnish National Gallery, Helsinki, Finland
Audio-visual Archive: Museum History Project
Interviews carried out in 2006, 2007 and 2011.

Vantaa City Museum, Vantaa, Finland
Audio-visual Archive: Museum History Project
Interview carried out in 2006.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Finnish Literature Society, traditional and contemporary cultural resources (formerly Folklore Archives), Helsinki, Finland.

Museo: My Museum Memories (Minun museomuistoni/SKS KRA. Museo. KRAK.), published in 2007.

INTERNET SOURCES

Cambridge Dictionary 2021. *Meaning of 'practicing' in English.* https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/practicing. Accessed 12 January 2021.

International Council of Museums (ICOM) 2007. *Museum Definition.* https://icom.museum/en/resources/standards-guidelines/museum-definition/. Accessed 12 January 2021.

Finnish Local Heritage Federation. *Kotiseutumuseot, muut paikallismuseot ja paikalliset erikoismuseot.* https://kotiseutuliitto.fi/tietopankki/kotiseutumuseot/. Accessed 12 January 2021.

Finnish Museums Association 2005. *Suomen museohistoria -tietokanta.* www.museoliitto.fi/museohistoria. Accessed 12 January 2021.

Finnish Museums Association 2008. *Museoväki '08.* https://www.museoliitto.fi/index.php?k=9746&hakustr=museov. Accessed 7 February 2021.

Zuanni, Chiara 2020. *Mapping Museum Digital Initiatives During COVID-19.* https://pro.europeana.eu/post/mapping-museum-digital-initiatives-during-covid-19. Accessed 12 January 2021.

PRESENTATIONS

Gendron, Adrienne 2020. 'Ethical Considerations in the Removal of Hazardous Materials.' Recording of a presentation at the *2020 Safety and Cultural Heritage Summit*, 30 October 2020, https://video.ibm.com/recorded/128574907?t=8042. Accessed 12 January 2021.

Gilchrist, Stephen 2014. 'Curating Australian Indigenous Art for an American Audience.' Presentation at the *Museum, Collecting, Agency conference*, 1–2 April 2014, University of Western Sydney.

Rohunen, Ulla 2020. 'Avaussanat.' Presentation at the Werstas Christmas seminar: *Kuka muistaa - hiljainen tieto museoissa*, 14 December 2020, Tampere.

LITERATURE

Aaltonen, Sanna & Högbacka Riitta 2015. 'Refleksiivisyyden ulottuvuudet.' In: Sanna Aaltonen & Riitta Högbacka (eds.) *Umpikujasta oivallukseen. Refleksiivisyys empiirisessä tutkimuksessa*, 9–31. Nuorisotutkimusverkosto/Nuorisotutkimusseura, julkaisuja 164. Tampere: Tampereen Yliopistopaino Oy – Juvenes Print.

Ahmas, Kristina 2014. *Norsunluutornin purkajat. Jaettu johtajuus ja kollektiivinen asiantuntijuus museossa*. Acta Wasaensia 318. Vaasa: University of Vaasa.

Ala-Pöllänen, Anne 2017. *Happy ship? Etnografinen tutkimus suomalaisista ja filippiiniläisistä merimiehistä suomalaisilla rahtilaivoilla*. Helsinki: Finnish Antiquarian Society.

Angus, Jim 2012. 'Innovations in Practice. An Examination of Technological Impacts in the Field.' *The Journal of Museum Education* 37(2), 37–45.

Anttonen, Erkki & Pettersson, Susanna 2006. 'Museoalan muistitietohistorian haastattelukysymykset.' *Museoiden muistitietopäivät,* 36–38. http://www.museoliitto.fi/doc/muistitietopaivat2006.pdf.

Arkio, Tuula 2015. *Jyviä nokkimassa. Taide-elämää meillä ja muualla.* Helsinki: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Siltala.

Auramies, Maija 2013. *Pysy pysy, puhu puhu - älä koskaan maaksi maadu. Seurasaaren tilat ja tarinat työyhteisön tulkitsemina*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Axelsson, Bodil 2019. 'Breaking the frames? The creation of digital curatorial agency at Swedish cultural history museums.' In: Brita Brenna, Hans Dam Christensen and Olav Hamran (eds.) *Museums as Cultures of Copies. The Crafting of Artefacts and Authenticity,* 239–252. Routledge Research in Museum Studies. London & New York: Routledge.

Bal, Mieke 1992. 'Telling, Showing, Showing off.' *Critical Inquiry* 18 (3), 556–594. https://doi.org/10.1086/448645.

Baldwin, Joan H. & Ackerson, Anne W. 2017. *Women in the Museum. Lessons from the Workplace*. London & New York: Routledge.

Bennett, Tony 1995. *The birth of the museum: History, theory, politics*. London & New York: Routledge.

Berliner, David 2015. ‘Are Anthropologists Nostalgist?’ In: Olivia Angé and David Berliner (eds.) *Anthropology and Nostalgia*, 17–34, New York: Berghahn Books.

Björklund, Maria & Silow Kallenberg, Kim 2019. ‘Institutionsetnologi. En inledning.’ *Kulturella Perspepktiv* 3–4, 2–12.

Bourdieu, Pierre 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boon, Marcus 2019. ‘Towards a future museum of copying.’ In Brita Brenna, Hans Dam Christensen and Olav Hamran (eds.) *Museums as Cultures of Copies. The Crafting of Artefacts and Authenticity*, 253–266. Routledge Research in Museum Studies. London & New York: Routledge.

Borowiecki, Karol Jan, Forbes, Neil, & Fresa, Antonella 2016. ‘Section 1: Introduction.’ In: Karol Jan Borowiecki, Neil Forbes, and Antonella Fresa (eds.) *Cultural Heritage in a Changing World*, xix–xxix. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29544-2.

Boylan, Patrick J. 2006. ‘The Museum Profession.’ In: Sharon Macdonald (ed.) *A Companion to Museum Studies*, 415–430. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996836.ch25.

Brenna, Brita 2016. ‘Kvalitet og deltakelse i museer’. In Knut Ove Eliassen & Øyvind Prytz (eds.) *Kvalitetsforståelser. Kvalitetsbegrepet i samtidens kunst og kultur* (Understandings of Quality. Quality Concepts in Contemporary Art and Culture), 36– 52. Oslo: Fagbokforlaget.

Brenna, Brita, Christensen, Hans Dam & Hamran, Olav 2019. ‘Introduction.’ In: Brita Brenna, Hans Dam Christensen and Olav Hamran (eds) *Museums as Cultures of Copies. The Crafting of Artefacts and Authenticity*, 1–7. Routledge Research in Museum Studies. London & New York: Routledge.

Bull, John, D. 2020. ‘”...Threat and Opportunity to Be Found in the Disintegrating World.” (O’Hara 2003, 71) – The Potential for Transformative Museum Experiences in the Post-Covid Era.’ *Journal of Conservation and Museum Studies*, 18(1), http://doi.org/10.5334/jcms.203.

Bunce, Louise 2016. ‘Appreciation of Authenticity Promotes Curiosity. Implications for Object-based Learning in Museums.’ *Journal of Museum Education* 41(3), 230–239.

Bueger, Christian 2017. ‘Practices, Norms, and the Theory of Contestation.’ *Polity* 49(1), 126–131. https://doi.org/10.1086/689977.

Carman, John 2006. 'Digging the Dirt. Excavation as a Social Practice.' In: Matt Edgeworth (ed) *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice. Cultural Encounters, Material Transformations*, 95–102. Worlds of Archaeology Series. Lanham: AltaMira Press.

Castells, Manuel 2010. *The Rise of the Network Society*. 2nd edition, with a new pref. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Chapman, Malcolm 2015. 'Managing Collections or Managing Content? The Evolution of Museum Collections Management Systems.' In: Sharon Macdonald and Helen Rees Leahy (eds.) *The International Handbooks of Museum Studies*: *Museum Practice,* 267–292. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ld. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118829059.wbihms212.

Chenhall, Robert & Vance, David 2010. 'The World of (Almost) Unique Objects.' In: Ross Parry (ed.) *Museums in a Digital Age*, 39–47. Abingdon: Routledge.

Čeginskas, Viktorija 2016. *Multicultural Belonging. Individuals Across Cultures, Languages and Places*. Turun yliopiston julkaisuja – Annales Universitatis Turkuensis, Sarja/ser. B, osa/tom. 411, Humaniora. Turku: University of Turku. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-29-6335-5.

Corradi, Gessica, Gherardi, Silvia & Verzelloni, Luca 2010. 'Through the Practice Lens. Where is the Bandwagon of Practice-Based Studies Heading?' *Management Learning* 41(3), 265–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507609356938.

Crooke, Elizabeth 2015. 'The "Active Museum". How Concern with Community Transformed the Museum.' In: Sharon Macdonald and Helen Rees Leahy (eds.) *The International Handbooks of Museum Studies*: *Museum Practice,* 481–502. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ld. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118829059.

Dana, John Cotton 1917. *The Gloom of the Museum*. Woodstock, Vt: Elm Tree Press.

Davies, Charlotte Aull 2002. *Reflexive ethnography. A guide to researching selves and others*. London & New York: Routledge.

Desvallées, André & Mairesse, François (eds.) 2010. *Key Concepts of Museology*. Paris: Armand Colin.

Drake, Knut 1994. 'Muumiosta mediatyöntekijäksi. Museotyöntekijöiden ammattikuvan muuttuminen.' *Museo* 4/1994, 6–8.

Ehanti, Eero 2020. 'Kenen höyhenissä?' https://icomfinland.fi/blogi/2020/7/22/kenen-hoyhenissa. Accessed 7 February 2021.

Ehanti, Eero, Turtiainen, Minna & Patokorpi, Lassi 2019. 'Mitä tapahtui uuden museomääritelmän äänestyksessä?' https://icomfinland.fi/blogi/museomaaritelma. Accessed 7 February 2021.

Ehn, Billy 2001. 'Universitet som arbetsplats. Reflektioner kring ledarskap och kollegial professionalism.' *Etnologiska skrifter* 26. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Ehn, Billy 2014. 'Arjen yllätyksiä. Huomaamaton etnografia ja kulttuurianalyysi.' In: Pilvi Hämeenaho and Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto (eds.) *Moniulotteinen etnografia*, 59–75. Ethnos-toimite 17. Helsinki: Ethnos ry.

Ehn, Billy & Löfgren, Orvar 1982. *Kulturanalys. Ett etnologiskt perspektiv*. Lund: Liber Förlag.

Ekström, Karin M. 2020. 'Introduction.' In: Karin M. Ekström (ed.) *Museum Marketization. Cultural Institutions in the Neoliberal Era*, 1–15. London & New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429401510.

Ekosaari, Maija 2008. *Tietokoneet museotyössä: Suomalaisten taidemuseoiden tiedonhallinnan historia ja nykytila*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:jyu-20081194063.

Evans, E. Margaret, Mull, Melinda & Poling, Deveraux 2002. 'The Authentic Object? A Child's-Eye View.' In: Scott G. Paris (ed.) *Perspectices on Object-Centered Learning in Museums*, 55–77, Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fine, Gary Alan & Hallett, Tim 2003. 'Dust. A Study in Sociological Miniaturism.' *The Sociological Quarterly* 44(1), 1–15.

Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK 2019. ''Ihmiseen kohdistuvan tutkimuksen eettiset periaatteet ja ihmistieteiden eettinen ennakkoarviointi Suomessa. *Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan julkaisuja 3/2019*. https://tenk.fi/sites/default/files/2021-01/Ihmistieteiden_eettisen_ennakkoarvioinnin_ohje_2020.pdf.

Gazi, Andromache 1990. 'Museums and National Cultural Property: I. The question of restitution.' *Museum Management and Curatorship* 9(2), 121–135. https://doi.org/10.1080/09647779009515203.

Genoways, Hugh H. & Andrei, Mary Anne (eds.) 2008. *Museum Origins. Readings in Early Museum History and Philosophy*. London & New York: Routledge.

Gherardi, Silvia 2006. *Organizational Knowledge. The Texture of Workplace Learning*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Gherardi Silvia 2012. ‘Why Do Practices Change and Why Do They Persist? Models of Explanations.’ In: Paul Hager, Alison Lee and Ann Reich (eds.) *Practice, Learning and Change. Practice-Theory Perspectives on Professional Learning*, 217–231. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4774-6_14.

Gherardi, Silvia 2015. ‘How the Turn to Practice may contribute to Working Life Studies.’ *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies* 5, 13–25. https://doi.org/10.19154/njwls.v5i3a.4831.

Gherardi, Silvia 2017. ‘Sociomateriality in Posthuman Practice Theory.’ In: Allison Hui, Theodore Schatzki and Elizabeth Shove (eds.) *The Nexus of Practices. Connections, Constellations, Practitioners*, 38–51. London & New York: Routledge.

Giddens, Anthony 1979. *Central Problems in Social Theory. Action, Structure, and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Giddens, Anthony 1984. *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gradén, Lizette 2019. *Rethinking collection practices with Frances Lloyd-Barnes at MIA*. MuseumNext, Online journal for ICOM. https://www.museumnext.com/article/rethinking-collection-practice-with-frances-lloyd-baynes-at-mia/. Accessed 10 August 2021.

Gradén, Lizette & O'Dell, Tom 2016. ‘Museums and Heritage Collections in the Cultural Economy: The Challenge of Addressing Wider Audiences and Local Communities.’ *Museum International* 68 (3-4), 48-67. https://doi.org/10.1111/muse.12135

Gradén, Lizette & Tom O’Dell 2018a. ‘Introduction. Museums and the Performance of Heritage in Nordic Contexts.’ *Scandinavian Studies* 90 (3), 311–330. https://doi.org/10.5406/scanstud.90.3.0311.

Gradén, Lizette & O'Dell, Tom 2018b. ‘Striving to Grow. The Challenge of Re-imagining Nordic Heritage in North America.’ *Scandinavian Studies*, 90(3), 436-460. https://doi.org/10.5406/scanstud.90.3.0436.

Gradén, Lizette & O’Dell, Tom 2018c. ‘Hip Heritage and Contemporary Tastes. Packaging the Nordic in the American Cultural Market.’ *Nordisk Museologi* 1(2018), 45–61. https://doi.org/10.5617/nm.6397.

Gustavsson, Karin 2014. *Expeditioner i det förflutna. Etnologiska fältarbeten och försvinnande allmogekultur under 1900-talets början*. Nordiska museets handlingar 140. Stockholm: Nordiska museets förlag.

Hakamies, Inkeri 2016. 'Tutkimuksen monet dialogit.' In: Jukka Jouhki and Tytti Steel (eds.) *Etnologinen tulkinta ja analyysi. Kohti avoimempaa tutkimusprosessia*, 200–235. Ethnos-toimite 18. Helsinki: Ethnos ry.

Hannula, Leena 2019. *Kävijät, kokijat, kokemukset. Museologinen tutkimus Siffin senioriklubista taidemuseon keskiössä*. JYU Dissertations 50. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-7638-5.

Harrison, Julia 2005. 'Shaping Collaboration. Considering Institutional Culture.' *Museum Management and Curatorship* 20, 195–212.

Harvilahti, Lauri 2012. 'Finland.' In: Regina F. Bendix and Galit Hasan-Rokem (eds.) *A Companion to Folklore,* 391–408. Hoboken, NJ: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118379936.ch20.

Hatakka, Mari 2007. 'Narratiivisen käänteen vaikutus museoiden toimintaan ja tutkimukseen.' *Elore*, 14(1). https://doi.org/10.30666/elore.78634.

Hatakka, Mari 2010. 'Museo muistojen paikkana.' In: Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen (eds.) *Suomen museohistoria*, 113–125. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Heinonen, Jouko 1984. 'ATK ja museot.' *Museopolitiikka* 2/1984, 21.

Heinonen, Jouko 2010. 'Kotiseutumuseoiden ja muiden paikallismuseoiden synty.' In: Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen (eds.) *Suomen museohistoria*, 153–167. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Heinonen, Jouko & Lahti, Markku 2001. *Museologian perusteet*. 3. uudistettu painos. Suomen museoliiton julkaisuja 49. Helsinki: Finnish Museums Association.

Hieta, Hanneleena 2010: *Mukautuva museo. Kolmen eurooppalaisen kansanelämänmuseon muutostarina 1970-luvulta 2000-luvun alkuun*. Turku: University of Turku. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-29-4329-6.

Hieta, Hanneleena 2012. 'A Concise History of an Institution.' In *Ethnologia Fennica* 39, 138–140.

Hill, Kate 2012. 'Introduction. Museums and Biographies – Telling Stories about People, Things and Relationships.' In: Kate Hill (ed.) *Museums and Biographies. Stories, Objects, Identities*, 1–9. Heritage Matters 9. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.

Hill, Kate 2016. *Women and museums 1850–1914. Modernity and the gendering of knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Hirvi, Laura 2013. *Identities in Practice. A Trans-Atlantic Ethnography of Sikh Immigrants in Finland and in California*. Studia Fennica Ethnologica 15. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Hirvi, Laura & Snellman, Hanna 2012. 'Introduction. Nine Tales of the Field.' In: Laura Hirvi & Hanna Snellman (eds.) *Where is the Field? The Experience of Migration Viewed through the Prism of Ethnographic Fieldwork,* 7–20. Studia Fennica Ethnologica 14. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. http://dx.doi.org/10.21435/sfe.14.

Hofstede, Geert 2001. *Culture's Consequences. Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hollifield, C. Ann, Kosicki Gerald M. & Becker Lee B. 2001. 'Organizational vs. Professional Culture in the Newsroom. Television News Directors' and Newspaper Editors' Hiring Decisions.' *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 45(1), 92–117. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15506878jobem4501_7.

Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean 1992. *Museums and the shaping of knowledge*. London & New York: Routledge.

Hui, Schatzki, Schatzki, Theodore & Shove, Elizabeth 2017. 'Introduction.' In: Allison Hui, Theodore Schatzki and Elizabeth Shove (eds.) *The Nexus of Practices. Connections, constellations, practitioners*, 1–7. London & New York: Routledge.

Huovinen, Anja-Tuulikki 2010. 'Lukijalle.' In: Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen (eds.) *Suomen museohistoria*, 7–8. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Hänninen, Kirsi 2006. *Visiosta toimintaan. Museoiden ympäristökasvatus sosiokulttuurisena jatkumona, säätelymekanismina ja innovatiivisena viestintänä*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 57. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Härö, Mikko 2010. 'Maan museotoimen kivijalka eli Museoviraston ja Suomen kansallismuseon historiaa.' In: Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen (eds.) *Suomen museohistoria*, 129–152. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Häyrinen, Ari 2012. *Open sourcing digital heritage. Digital surrogates, museums and knowledge management in the age of open networks.* Jyväskylä studies in humanities 187. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Ilvas, Juha 2006. 'Ohjeita haastattelijalle.' *Museoiden muistitietopäivät,* 39–41. http://www.museoliitto.fi/doc/muistitietopaivat2006.pdf.

Immonen, Visa 2016. *Tutkimuksen ja hallinnon ristiaallokossa: 2/1917–1972*. Helsinki: Finnish Heritage Agency.

Jones, Mike 2021. *Artefacts, Archives, and Documentation in the Relational Museum*. London & New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003092704.

Jones, Paul & Macleod, Suzanne 2016. 'Museum Architecture Matters.' *Museum & Society* 14(1), 207–219.

Jouhki, Jukka & Steel, Tytti 2016. 'Analyysin ja tulkinnan ulottuvuuksia etnologiassa.' In: Jukka Jouhki & Tytti Steel (eds.) *Etnologinen tulkinta ja analyysi. Kohti avoimempaa tutkimusprosessia*, 13–42. Ethnos-toimite 18. Helsinki: Ethnos ry.

Jung, Yuha 2016. 'Micro examination of museum workplace culture. How institutional changes influence the culture of a real-world art museum.' *Museum Management and Curatorship* 31(2), 159–177. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2015.1117393.

Kallio, Kalle 2010. 'Museolaitos sai historian.' *Kasvatus & Aika*, 4(3), 97-113. https://journal.fi/kasvatusjaaika/article/view/68233. Accessed 10 August 2021.

Kava, Ritva 1993. *Emil Cedercreutz - Satakunnan eurooppalainen. Kuvanveistäjä kotiseutu- ja museomiehenä*. Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society.

Kavanagh, Gaynor 1991. 'The articulation of professional self-consciousness.' In: Gaynor Kavangh (ed.) *The Museums Profession. Internal and External Relations*, 37–55. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Kavanagh, Gaynor 1994. 'Introduction.' In: Gaynor Kavanagh (ed.) *Museum Provision and Professionalism,* 1–12. London: Routledge.

Kecskeméti, István 2008. *Papyruksesta megabitteihin. Arkisto- ja valokuvakokoelmien konservoinnin prosessin hallinta*. Jyväskylä studies in humanities 93. Arkistolaitoksen toimituksia 3. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Keene, Suzanne 2011. *Digital Collections. Museums and the Information Age*. London & New York: Routledge.

Kelly, Lynda and Gordon, Phil 2002. 'Developing a community of practice. Museums and reconciliation in Australia'. In: Richard Sandell (ed.) *Museums, Society, Inequality*, 153–174, London: Routledge.

Kiianmies, Mirka 2012. *Museomiehistä museonaisiin. Museoalan naisistuminen Suomessa 1950–1980-luvuilla*. Tampere: University of Tampere. http://www.urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:uta-1-22305.

Kinanen, Pauliina 2010. 'Suomen museoliitto museokentän rakentajana.' In: Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen (eds.) *Suomen museohistoria*, 62–93. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara 1998. *Destination Culture. Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Pres.

Knuutinen, Ulla 2009. *Kulttuurihistoriallisten materiaalien menneisyys ja tulevaisuus. Konservoinnin materiaalitutkimuksen heritologiset funktiot*. Jyväskylä studies in humanities 114. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Korhonen, Teppo 1989. 'Museoitu Suomi'. In: Teppo Korhonen and Matti Räsänen (eds.) *Kansa kuvastimessa. Etnisyys ja identiteetti*, 105–106. Tietolipas 114. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Korn, Randi 2018. *Intentional Practice for Museums. A Guide for Maximizing Impact*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Koskinen-Koivisto, Eerika 2014. 'Tutkimuskohteena läheinen ihminen. Refleksiivisen ja dialogisen tutkimusotteen mahdollisuudet ja rajoitteet etnografisessa tutkimuksessa.' *Elore* 21(2). https://doi.org/10.30666/elore.79152.

Kostet, Juhani 2010. 'Onko suomalaisella museolla aatteellista perustaa?' In: Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen (eds.) *Suomen museohistoria*, 17–26. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Kreps, Christina 2003.' Curatorship as Social Practice.' *Curator: The Museum Journal* 46, 311–323. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2003.tb00097.x.

Krogh Jensen, Susanne 2019. 'What a curator needs to know. The development of professional museum work and the skills required in Danish museums 1964–2018.' *Museum Management and Curatorship* 34(5), 468–485, https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2019.1641832.

Kurkinen, Liisa 2020. *Tiskin takana kauppias. Kauppiaselämäkerrat maaseudun murroksen kuvaajina*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-6655-18-5.

Köstlin, Konrad 2014. 'On Anniversaries'. *Cultural Analysis* 13, (What´s in a Discipline? Special issue on the Occasion of the 50th anniversary of the International Society for Ethnology and Folklore), 11–21.

Laine-Zamojska, Magdalena 2017. *The Role of Small, Local History Museums in Creating Digital Heritage. The Finnish Case*. Jyväskylä studies in humanities 310. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-7015-4.

Lave, Jean & Wenger, Etienne 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Layder, Derek 1998. *Sociological practice. Linking theory and social research*. London: Sage.

Legget, Jane 2017. 'Museums and Public Policy. An introduction.' *Museum International* 69 (3–4), 6-9. https://doi.org/10.1111/muse.12169.

Levanto, Marjatta 2010. 'Suomen museoiden yleisöt.' In: Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen (eds.) *Suomen museohistoria*, 94–109. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Levin, Amy K. (ed.) 2010. *Gender, Sexuality and Museums*. A Routledge Reader. London & New York: Routledge.

Linell, Per 2009. *Rethinking language, mind, and world dialogically. Interactional and contextual theories of human sense-making*. Charlotte (N.C.): IAP-Information Age.

Lonkila, Helena 2016. *Syvällä sydänmaassa – Yrjö Blomstedtin ja Victor Sucksdorffin Kainuu*. Jyväskylä studies in humanities 281. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-6545-7.

Lundgren, Britta (ed.) 2002. *Akademisk kultur. Vetenskapsmiljöer i kulturanalytisk belysning*. Etnologiska skrifter 27. Stockholm: Carlsson.

Löfgren, Orvar 2012. 'Material Culture.' In: Regina Bendix & Galit Hasan-Rokem (eds.): *A Companion to Folklore*, 169–183. First Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Löfgren, Orvar 2014a. 'The Black Box of Everyday Life. Entanglements of Stuff, Affects, and Activities.' *Cultural Analysis* 13, 77–98.

Löfgren, Orvar 2014b. 'At the Ethnologists' Ball. Changing an Academic Habitus.' *Ethnologia Europaea* 44(2), 116–122.

Löfgren, Orvar & Wilk, Richard 2006. 'In Search of Missing Processes.' In: Orvar Löfgren and Richard Wilk (eds.) *Off the edge. Experiments in cultural analysis*, 5–12. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Macdonald, Sharon 2002. *Behind the Scenes at the Science Museum*. Oxford & New York: Berg.

Maleuvre, Didier 1999. *Museum memories. History, technology, art*. Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press.

Marcus, George & Fishcer, Michael M. J. 1986. *Anthropology as cultural critique. An experimental moment in the human sciences*. Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press.

Marder, Michael 2016. *Dust*. *Object Lessons*. New York & London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Marshall, Matilda 2016. *Hållbarhet till middag*. *En etnologisk studie om hur miljövänligt ätande praktiseras i vardagslivet*. Ekologiska skrifter nr 62, Umeå universitet. Höör: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposion.

Marty, Paul F. 2006. 'Finding the skills for tomorrow. Information literacy and museum information professionals.' *Museum Management and Curatorship* 21(4), 317–335. https://doi.org/10.1080/09647770600702104.

Marty, Paul F. 2007. 'The Changing Nature of Information Work in Museums.' *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 58(1), 97–107, https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20443.

Marty, Paul F., Soren, Barbara J. & Armstrong, Jackie 2013. 'Building community among museum information professionals. A case study of the Museum Computer Network.' *Museum Management and Curatorship* 28 (4), 394–412. https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2013.831249.

Marty, Paul F. & Kim, Castle U. 2020. 'Trending MCN. Fifty Years of Museum Computing Conferences and Community.' *Curator* 63, 193–215. https://doi.org/10.1111/cura.12355.

McCaffrey, Graham, Raffin-Bouchal, Shelley, & Moules, Nancy J. 2012. 'Hermeneutics as Research Approach. A Reappraisal.' *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 11(3), 214–229. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691201100303.

McCall, Vikki & Gray, Clive 2014. 'Museums and the 'new museology'. Theory, practice and organisational change.' In *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 29 (1), 19–35, https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2013.869852.

McCarthy, Conal 2015. 'Introduction: Grounding Museum Studies. Introducing Practice.' In: Sharon Macdonald and Helen Rees Leahy (eds.) *The International Handbooks of Museum Studies*: *Museum Practice*, xxxv–lii. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ld. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118829059.wbihms200.

McCarthy, Conal 2016. 'Theorising Museum Practice through Practice Theory.' In Pamela Burnard, Elizabeth Mackinlay and Kimberly Powell (eds.) *The Routledge International Handbook of Intercultural Arts Research*, 24–34. London & New York: Routledge. https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315693699.ch3.

Message, Kylie & Dudley, Sarah 2014. 'Editorial.' *Museum Worlds* 2(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.3167/armw.2014.020101.

Mikkola, Kati 2009a. *Tulevaisuutta vastaan. Uutuuksien vastustus, kansantiedon keruu ja kansakunnan rakentaminen*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 1251. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Mikkola, Kati 2009b. 'New Clothing Fashions as Expressions of Modernization and Targets of Resistance.' *Ethnologia Fennica* 36, 35–47.

Mikkola, Kati, Olsson, Pia & Stark, Eija 2019. 'Minority Cultures and the Making of Cultural Heritage Archives in Finland.' *Ethnologia Europaea* 49(1), 58–73. https://doi.org/10.16995/ee.818.

Morley, Janine 2017. 'Technologies within and beyond practices.' In: Allison Hui, Theodore Schatzki and Elizabeth Shove (eds.) *The nexus of practice. How social life hangs together*, 81–97. London & New York: Routledge.

Mäkelä, Asko 2005. 'Digi tuli museoon.' In: Tuukka Talvio (ed.) *Museon muisti. Ritva Wäreen juhlakirja,* 121–136. Taidehistoriallisia tutkimuksia 31. Helsinki: Society for Art History in Finland.

Neitola, Uula 2019. *Museoammattilaisen mukana*. Helsinki: Union of Academic
Museum Employees (MAL) ry.

Nieroba, Elżbieta 2018. 'Dynamics in the Field of Museums. Contemporary Challenges for Polish Museologists.' *Social Sciences* 7(5), 77. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci7050077.

Norton-Westbrook, Halona 2015. 'The Pendulum Swing. Curatorial Theory Past and Present.' In: Sharon Macdonald and Helen Rees Leahy (eds.) *The International Handbooks of Museum Studies*: *Museum Practice*, 341–356. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ld. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118829059.wbihms215.

Nyman, Harri 2011. *Uloimmalla rannalla. Luotsi- ja majakkamiesperheet asemayhdyskunnissaan*. Kansatieteellinen Arkisto 54. Helsinki: Finnish Antiquarian Society.

Olsrud, Janne W. 2019. 'Documenting museum objects. A practice of copying and a "copious" practice?' In: Brita Brenna, Hans Dam Christensen and Olav Hamran (eds.) *Museums as Cultures of Copies. The Crafting of Artefacts and Authenticity*, 225–237. Routledge Research in Museum Studies. London & New York: Routledge.

Ortner, Sherry 2006. *Anthropology and social theory. Culture, power, and the acting subject*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Orr, Noreen 2006. 'Museum Volunteering. Heritage as "Serious Leisure".' *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12(2), 194–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250500496169.

Paaskoski 2008. *Herrana metsässä. Kansatieteellinen tutkimus metsänhoitajuudesta*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1170, Tiede. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Palviainen, Ritva 2010. 'Museotyön ammatillistuminen.' In: Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen (eds.) *Suomen museohistoria*, 315–331. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Parry, Ross 2007. *Recoding the Museum. Digital Heritage and the Technologies of Change*. Museum Meanings. London and New York: Routledge.

Parry, Ross 2010a. 'The Practice of Digital Heritage and the Heritage of Digital Practice.' In: Ross Parry (ed.) *Museums in a Digital Age*, 1–7. Leicester Readers in Museum Studies. London and New York: Routledge.

Parry, Ross. 2010b. 'Introduction to Part One.' In: Ross Parry (ed.) Museums in a Digital Age, 11–14. Leicester Readers in Museum Studies. London and New York: Routledge.

Pettersson, Susanna 2006. 'Museohistorian kirjoittaminen on meistä kiinni.' *Museoiden muistitietopäivät,* 3–4. http://www.museoliitto.fi/doc/muistitietopaivat2006.pdf. Accessed 7 February 2021.

Pettersson, Susanna 2008. *Suomen Taideyhdistyksestä Ateneumiin. Fredrik Cygnaeus, Carl Gustaf Estlander ja taidekokoelman roolit*. Historiallisia tutkimuksia 240. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Pettersson, Susanna 2011. 'National Museums in Finland. Building National Museums in Europe 1750-2010.' In Peter Aronsson and Gabriella Elgenius (eds) *Conference proceedings from EuNaMus, European National Museums. Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen,* 261–288. EuNaMus Report No 1. Linköping:

Linköping University Electronic Press. http://www.ep.liu.se/ecp_home/index.en.aspx?issue=064.

Pettersson, Susanna 2019. ‘Museot ja osaamisen aika.’ In: Uula Neitola (ed.) *Museoammattilaisen mukana*, 8–11. Helsinki: Union of Academic Museum Employees (MAL) ry.

Pettersson, Susanna & Kinanen, Pauliina 2010a. ‘Matkalla Suomen museohistoriaan.’ In: Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen (eds.) *Suomen museohistoria*, 9–13. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Pettersson, Susanna & Kinanen, Pauliina (eds.) 2010b. *Suomen museohistoria*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Pierroux, Palmyre, Hetland, Per and Esborg, Line 2020. ‘Traversing citizen science and citizen humanities.’ In: Palmyre Pierroux, Per Hetland and Line Esborg (eds.) *A History of Participation in Museums and Archives*, 3–24. London & New York: Routledge.

Potinkara, Nika 2015. *Etnisyyden rakentuminen kahden saamelaismuseon perusnäyttelyissä*. Jyväskylä studies in humanities 272. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-6400-9.

Raatikainen, Panu 2005. ‘Ihmistieteet - tiedettä vai tulkintaa?’ In: Anneli Meurman-Solin and Ilkka Pyysiäinen (eds.) *Ihmistieteet tänään*, 39–61. Helsingin yliopiston Tutkijakollegium. Helsinki: Gaudeamus Kirja/University Press Finland Ltd.

Rauhala, Anna 2019. *Neulonnan taito*. Kansatieteellinen Arkisto 59. Helsinki: Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistys.

Reckwitz, Andreas 2002. ‘Toward a Theory of Social Practices. A Development in Culturalist Theorizing.’ *European Journal of Social Theory* 5(2), 243–263. https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310222225432.

Reckwitz, Andreas 2017. ‘Practices and their Affects.’ In: Allison Hui, Theodore Schatzki and Elizabeth Shove (eds.) *The nexus of practice. How social life hangs together*, 114–125. London & New York: Routledge.

Reidla, Jana 2018. ‘Curators with and without Collections. A Comparative Study of Changes in the Curator’s Work at National Museums in Finland and in the Baltic States.’ *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics* 12 (2), 115–138. https://doi.org/10.2478/jef-2018-0014.

Reidla, Jana 2020. ‘Who Is Leading the Project? A Comparative Study of Exhibition Production Practices at National Museums in Finland and the

Baltic States.' *Museum and Society* 18(4), 368–385. https://doi.org/10.29311/mas.v18i4.3456.

Reijonen, Henni 2010. 'Suomalaisten museokokoelmien konservoinnin historiaa.' In: Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen (eds.) *Suomen museohistoria*, 288–311. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Rentschler, Ruth 2007. 'Museum marketing. No longer a dirty word.' In: Ruth Rentschler and Anne-Marie Hede (eds.) *Museum Marketing. Competing in the Global Marketplace*, 12–20. London & New York: Routledge.

Rinkinen, Jenny, Jalas, Mikko & Shove, Elizabeth 2015. 'Object Relations in Accounts of Everyday Life.' *Sociology* 49(5), 870–885. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038515577910.

Rinta-Porkkunen, Nina & Ylitalo, Saija 2003. 'If we do not know our past, we have no future. The importance of a museum and a home district for local identity.' *Nordisk Museologi* 1/2003, 111–128. https://doi.org/10.5617/nm.3398.

Robbins, Nina 2016. *Poisto museokokoelmasta. Museologinen arvokeskustelu kokoelmanhallinnan määrittäjänä*. Jyväskylä studies in humanities 283. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-6581-5.

Robbins, Nina 2017. 'Museum Collection Disposal. The role of museological value discussion in collection management.' *The Museum Review* 2(1). http://articles.themuseumreview.org/vol2no1robbins. Accessed 7 February 2021.

Robbins, Nina 2020. 'Promoting Value Practice in Museums Creates Impact.' *Curator* 63, 55–68. https://doi.org/10.1111/cura.12350.

Roberts, Joanne 2006. 'Limits to communities of practice.' *Journal of Management Studies* 43, 623–639. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00618.x.

Ruusuvuori, Johanna, Nikander, Pirjo & Hyvärinen, Matti 2010. 'Haastattelun analyysin vaiheet'. In: Johanna Ruusuvuori, Pirjo Nikander and Matti Hyvärinen (eds.) *Haastattelun analyysi*, 9–36. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Rönkkö, Marja-Liisa 1999. *Suomalainen taidemuseo. Louvren ja Louisianan perilliset*. Helsinki: Valtion taidemuseo.

Rönkkö, Marja-Liisa 2010. 'Museorakennukset ja näyttämisen taide.' In: Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen (eds.) *Suomen museohistoria*, 229–261. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Saarikoski, Petri. 2004. *Koneen lumo. Mikrotietokoneharrastus Suomessa 1970-luvulta 1990-luvun puoliväliin*. Nykykulttuurin tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 83. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Saarikoski, Helena 2014. *Silloin tanssittiin tangoa. Tanssikansan kertomaa 1900-luvulta*. Helsinki: Kulttuuriosuuskunta Partuuna.

Salminen, Elina 2011. *Monta kuvaa menneisyydestä. Etnologinen tutkimus museokokoelmien yksityisyydestä ja julkisuudesta*. Jyväskylä studies in humanities 149. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-4170-3.

Sandino, Linda 2012. 'A Curatocracy. Who and What is a V&A Curator?' In: Kate Hill (ed.) *Museums and Biographies. Stories, Objects, Identities*, 87–100. Heritage Matters 9. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.

Schatzki, Theodore R. 2001. 'Introduction. Practice theory.' In: Karin Knorr-Cetina, Eike von Savigny and Theodore R. Schatzki (eds.) *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, 10–23. London: Routledge

Selkokari, Hanne 2008. *Kalleuksia isänmaalle. Eliel Aspelin-Haapkylä taiteen keräilijänä ja taidehistorioitsijana*. Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen Aikakauskirja 115. Helsinki: Finnish Antiquarian Society.

Shah, Bhavesh, Hunter, Susana, Adams, Stuart, Bancroft, Anne & Blyth, Val 2011. 'When the Dust Settles. Dust Monitoring in Exhibitions at the Victoria and Albert Museum.' *International Preservation News* 53, 24–29.

Shove, Elizabeth 2003. 'Converging Conventions of Comfort, Cleanliness and Convenience.' *Journal of Consumer Policy* 26, 395–418. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026362829781.

Shove, Elizabeth & Pantzar, Mika 2010. 'Temporal Rhythms as Outcomes of Social Practices.' *Ethnologia Europaea* 40(1), 19–29. https://doi.org/10.16995/ee.1061.

Shove, Elizabeth, Pantzar, Mika & Watson, Matt 2012. *The Dynamics of Social Practice. Everyday Life and How it Changes*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Simmons, John E. 2015. 'Collection Care and Management. History, Theory, and Practice.' In: In: Sharon Macdonald and Helen Rees Leahy (eds.) *The International Handbooks of Museum Studies*: *Museum Practice*, 221–

248. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ld. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118829059.wbihms210.

Sjöberg-Pietarinen, Solveig 1997. *Kvinna I Museivärlden. En Studie I Irja Sahlbergs Museisyn*. Åbo: Etnologiska institutionen vid Åbo Akademi.

Sjöberg-Pietarinen, Solveig 2004. *Museer Ger Mening. Friluftsmuseerna Klosterbacken Och Amuri Som Representationer*. Åbo: Åbo Akademis förlag.

Snellman, Hanna 1999. 'Kansatieteilijä lapsuutensa maisemissa.' In: Marja Tuominen, Seija Tuulentie, Veli-Pekka Lehtola and Mervi Autti (eds.) *Pohjoisen identiteetit ja mentaliteetit: Tunturista tupaan*, 137–144. Rovaniemi: University of Lapland.

Snellman, Hanna 2003. 'Kansa tietää!' In: Pekka Laaksonen, Seppo Knuuttila and Ulla Piela (eds.) *Tutkijat kentällä*, 44–61. Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja 82. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Snellman, Hanna 2018. 'Työväentutkimus ja kansatiede.' In: Jarmo Peltola and Erkki Vasara (eds.) *Tehtävänä Työväenhistoria. Työväen Historian Ja Perinteen Tutkimuksen Seura 30 Vuotta*, 93–104. Helsinki: Finnish Society for Labour History.

Snyder William M. & Wenger, Etienne 2010. 'Our World as a Learning System. A Communities-of-Practice Approach.' In: Blackmore Chris (ed.) *Social Learning Systems and Communities of Practice,* 107–124. London: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84996-133-2_7.

Spalding, Julian 1991. 'Is there life in museums?' In: Gaynor Kavanagh (ed.) *The Museums Profession. Internal and External Relations*, 163–175. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Spock, Michael 2000. '"When I grow up I'd Like to Work in a Place Like This". Museum Professionals' Narratives of Eatly Interest in Museums.' *Curator* 43, 19–31. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2000.tb01157.x.

Spoof, Sanna Kaisa 2003. *Tiltun Kapiot. Iittiläinen Käsityöperinne*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 884. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Stark, Laura 2009. 'Empowering Practices. Perspectives on Modernization in Finland 1860–1960.' *Ethnologia Fennica* 36, 4–18.

Steedman, Carolyn 2002. *Dust. The Archive and Cultural History*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Steel, Tytti 2013. *Risteäviä eroja sataman arjessa*. Kansatieteellisiä tutkimuksia Helsingin yliopistossa 17. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:ISBN 978-952-10-9013-4.

Steel, Tytti & Tuori, Annamari 2019. 'Older jobseekers' temporal identity work. Relating to past, present, and future.' *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies* 9(3), 25–43. https://tidsskrift.dk/njwls/article/view/116055/164237.

Suominen, Jaakko 2003. *Koneen kokemus. Tietoteknistyvä kulttuuri modernisoituvassa Suomessa 1920-luvulta 1970-luvulle*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Sykäri, Venla 2012. 'Dialogic Methodology and the Dialogic Space Created after an Interview.' RMN Newsletter 4(4), 80–87.

Tatsi, Taavi 2011. 'Identity Struggles of Museum Professionals. Autonomous Expertise and Audience Participation in Exhibition Production.' *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics* 5(2), 65–80. https://www.jef.ee/index.php/journal/article/view/73>.

Talvio, Tuukka 2016. *Suomen kansallismuseo. Ikkuna menneeseen ja tulevaan*. Helsinki: Finnish Heritage Agency.

Telve, Keiu 2016.' Cross-border Commuting Changes the Way Work is Done. A Case Study of Estonian Blue-Collar and Skilled Workers in Finland.' *Ethnologia Fennica* 43, 28–42.

Thomas, Suzie, Wessman, Anna & Heikkilä, Eino 2018. 'Redesigning the museum studies programme at the University of Helsinki. Towards collaborative teaching and learning.' *Museum Management and Curatorship* 33(4), 344–364, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2018.1485115.

Tiili, Miia-Leena 2016. *Ammatillisuuden ankkuripaikat. Kinesteettinen ja kulttuurinen tieto Suomenlahden merivartiostossa*. Kansatieteellinen Arkisto 55. Helsinki: Finnish Antiquarian Society.

Tlili, Anwar 2015. 'In Search of Museum Professional Knowledge Base. Mapping the Professional Knowledge Debate onto Museum Work.' *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 48(11), 1100–1122. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2015.1091284.

Tran, Lynn Uyen & Heather King. 'Shared Professional Knowledge. Implications for Emerging Leaders.' *The Journal of Museum Education* 34(2), 149–162. www.jstor.org/stable/20877422.

Tuomaala, Saara 2009. 'The Bicycle and Bodily Identities of Rural Finnish Youth from the 1920 to the 1940's.' *Ethnologia Fennica* 36, 59–71.

Turunen, Arja 2009. 'Trousers and the Construction of Modern Woman.' *Ethnologia Fennica* 36, 48–58.

Valtonen, Hannu 2006. *Tavallisesta kuriositeetiksi. Kahden Keski-Suomen Ilmailumuseon Messerschmitt Bf 109 -lentokoneen museoarvo*. Jyväskylä studies in humanities 49. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Vanha-Similä, Maria 2017. *Yhtiöön, yhtiöön! Lapsiperheiden arki Forssan tehdasyhteisössä 1950–1970-luvuilla*. Kansatieteellinen Arkisto 58. Helsinki: Finnish Antiquarian Society.

Vasenkari, Maria & Pekkala, Armi 2000. 'Dialogic Methodology.' In Lauri Honko (ed.) *Thick Corpus, Organic Variation and Textuality in Oral Tradition*. Studia Fennica Folkloristica 7, 243–254. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Venäläinen, Päivi 2019. *Nykytaide oppimisen ympäristönä – Näkemyksiä nykytaiteesta, oppimisesta ja niiden kohtaamisesta*. JYU Dissertations 130. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-7848-8.

Vilkuna, Janne 2010a. 'Suomen museoalan organisoituminen 1945–2009.' In: Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen (eds.) *Suomen museohistoria*, 27–46. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Vilkuna, Janne 2010b. 'Museologia ja Suomen museot.' In: Susanna Pettersson and Pauliina Kinanen (eds.) *Suomen museohistoria*, 332–346. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1265, Tieto. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Vilkuna, Janne 2018. 'The development of Finnish museums over the last forty years.' *Nordisk Museologi* 1/2018, 96–103. https://doi.org/10.5617/nm.6401.

von Unge, Elin 2019. 'Institutionell oordning. Om glappet i "Museidebatten".' *Kulturella Perspektiv* 2019(3–4), 24–34.

Welch, Daniel & Warde, Alan 2017. 'How Should we Understand "General Understandings"?' In: Allison Hui, Theodore Schatzki & Elizabeth Shove (eds.) *The Nexus of Practices. Connections, Constellations, Practitioners*, 183–196. London & New York: Routledge.

Wenger, Etienne 1998. *Communities of Practice. Learning, Meaning, and Identity, Learning in Doing: Social, Cognitive, and Computational Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, Etienne 2010a. 'Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems. The Career of a Concept.' In: Chris Blackmore (ed.) *Social Learning Systems and Communities of Practice*, 179–198. London: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84996-133-2_11.

Wenger, Etienne 2010b. 'Conceptual Tools for CoPs as Social Learning Systems. Boundaries, Identity, Trajectories.' In: Chris Blackmore (ed.) *Social Learning Systems and Communities of Practice*, 125–143. London: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84996-133-2_8.

Whitelaw, Anne 2012. 'Women, Museums and the Problem of Biography.' In: Kate Hill (ed.) *Museums and Biographies. Stories, Objects, Identities*, 75–86. Heritage Matters 9. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.

Williams, David. 2010. 'A Brief History of Museum Computerization.' In: Ross Parry (ed.) *Museums in a Digital Age*, 15–21. London & New York: Routledge.

Willim, Robert 2006. 'Det obetydligas betydelse. Dammets kulturella dynamik.' In: Robert Willim (ed.) *ETN: HEM*, 55–64. Lund: Etnologiska institutionen, Lunds universitet.

Witcomb, Andrea 2003. *Re-imagining the museum. Beyond the mausoleum*. London & New York: Routledge.

Åstrom, Anna-Maria 2005. 'Den etnologiska forskningsprocessen – en djupdykning I mentala och materiella sfärer.' In: Pirjo Korkiakangas, Pia Olsson and Helena Ruotsala (eds.) *Polkuja etnologian menetelmiin*, 25–42. Ethnos-toimite 11. Helsinki: Ethnos ry.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW TEMPLATE

(Translated by the author)

Interview questions for ‘Oral History of the Museum Field’

Erkki Anttonen ja Susanna Pettersson

Preface

The purpose of this template is to present aspects that should be taken into account in the interviews. It would be a good idea to follow the structure of the template, at least loosely, in the course of interviews. The themes presented in the template are not necessarily direct questions but topics on which it would be interesting to obtain information. Thus, it would be desirable for the interviewer to develop individual questions for each interviewee. Some things need to be asked or discussed in more detail, some can be ignored more quickly — depending on the interviewee, his/her job description and the interview situation.

One useful and concrete perspective on the history and periods of each museum is the museum’s most notable exhibitions during the interviewee’s career (if he/she has been in one way or another dealing with exhibitions). They are concrete points of entry through which many of the issues related to the museum profession raised in the template can be discussed. At the same time, they create a certain chronology for the interview.

PERSONAL HISTORY

Childhood/Youth

With respect to the interviewee's childhood and youth, it is worth asking questions that may have been relevant to his or her later orientation in the museum field.

Place of residence and living environment during childhood/youth

The placement of the family in the social field of the locality

Social contacts of the family

Languages spoken in the family/in school

Family's hobbies/relationship with culture/relationship with nature

Interviewee's own attitude towards the family's hobbies

Voluntary choices

Recollections of early aesthetic experiences, impressive interiors, milieus and objects of cultural heritage (e.g. poetics of space and the cultural historical composition of the growing environment), or nature experiences

School and academic education

From the project's point of view, it is interesting to know how, for example, the interviewee's education and personal contacts during his/her studies influenced the career choice and acting in the profession.

Which topics the interviewee found interesting in school (and which not)

Attitude towards disciplines of history, arts, natural history

Studies in higher education/university/other studies — what did the interviewee study?

Major subject and other disciplines studied

The topic of diploma work/master's thesis

Has the topic been significant later?

Most important teachers/mentors

The possible influence of teachers on later orientation

Significant moments during studies and for later career, e.g. excursions, books, encounters

What sort of contacts did the interviewee establish during his/her studies (closest peers, how have they been placed)

Have the contacts meant something for the career and profession?

Orientation to working life and career:

Which factors guided the interest in history/cultural history/art history/archaeology/museology/natural history?

First encounters with history/art (and artists that had an influence through their work), nature experiences and hobbies

First museum experiences

Passionate interest stemming from natural phenomena (concerns interviewees from museums of natural history)

Have specific exhibitions made an impression on you?

Beginning of the career: first museum work experiences (internships or summer jobs) during studies

Full-time museum career — when and how (was the museum field a clear choice from the beginning/did the interviewee drift towards the museum field)?

Developments in career: fixed term contracts, permanent contract (other jobs, periods of unemployment)

After entering the museum field: important contacts in the early phase/later phase

What sort of significance did the spouse have with respect to the career choice (was he/she from the same field or otherwise interested in culture/art)?

Significance of other possible sideline occupations (e.g. associations, political activity)

MUSEUM PROFESSION

It is not necessary to go through all the topics below with the interviewee, but mainly the points that are relevant to him/her. The topics are divided into questions related to the museum in general and the interviewee's personal professional career. These areas can also be combined according to the interview situation. In any case, the actual questions should be designed with the topics below in mind, but still on a 'case-by-case basis' in relation to the career, profession and personal history of each interviewee.

History and the different periods of the museum in general:

The birth of the museum/pivotal changes/reforms in its functions/building/administration?

Museum's activities in the (art)field and possible changes in its forms?

Political decision-making processes and relations at the political/societal level — relevance to the museum/how have the relationships been at this level/what possible problems have occurred?

Contextualising the process of change (relation to changes in society and cultural sector)

Outsider factors that have influenced the museum and its activities

- facilities, technology
- general attitudes

The effects of the economic developments of the museum in general

Possible international contacts and their significance for the museum (how does this differ between the different occupational groups within the museum?)

Personnel, museum profession and general changes to the field:

What sorts of changes have taken place in the museum's personnel during the interviewee's time?

The structural (quantitative and qualitative) changes in the personnel, etc.:

- What sorts of changes have taken place in the museum profession?
- Did specialisation take place?
- Did new occupational groups form in the museum?
- Changes in the gender divide, etc.

How did the possible professional specialisation affect the museum's activities and practices?

Changes in the museum profession on a personal level:

How has the interviewee's own museum career developed: changes in one's career during early/later stages?

Did the interviewee achieve her/his desired position in the museum, or would he/she have wanted to do something else in the museum: if so, what?

How does the interviewee perceive his/her own role in the museum/position in the field? Possible changes in the role or position?

Most important professional highlights/crises (within/outside the organisation). The history/stages of the highlights/crises and their effect on a general level as well as with respect to museum politics and his/her own professional development?

How would you describe your professional expertise, acquired throughout your career, and what are your key strengths? What sort of expertise have you needed at different times, and how has it varied?

What kind of meaning has your own/your colleagues' expertise (e.g. taste in arts or interests) had for collection/exhibition policies?

How would you describe those personal characteristics and abilities that have played a role when working in the museum field?

Has the museum career involved conflicts between different roles (e.g. has not been able to pursue his/her interests/make use of all of his/her assets)?

The effect of the interviewee's gender on career development/status within the museum/possibilities to advance his/her own ideas in the museum?

Who have been the most important colleagues: personal relationships within the museum/in the museum field and/or networking on a national or international level?

Possible conflicts in personal relations or policies within the museum? How have they affected the interviewee's work in the museum?

Have there been conflicts with other stakeholders outside the museum field: university research and researchers, museum associations, hobbyists, collectors, artists, critics, officers from the municipality or Ministry of Education and Culture, politicians, etc.?

Positions of trust in the museum field?

The significance of special projects or memberships on committees?

The following topics should be asked insofar as they relate to the interviewee's profession and career:

Exhibition and collection policies and changes in their emphases in the museum?

Values and valuations in relation to time, changes and trends?

Personal views in relation to those of predecessors, different points of emphasis?

The relationship between exhibitions and research?

Producing knowledge or popularising knowledge?

Relationship with the academic community?

Publication activities and changes therein, different publication types — who are the target audiences?

Customer base and possible changes therein? When was the 'wider audience' understood as consisting of smaller entities?

Economic development — the significance of self-financing and profit responsibility as well as the effects of sponsorships?

The development of museum pedagogy — what, for whom and how?

The development of conservation — is it part of collection policy?

Networking and collaboration nationally/abroad?

Research activities and its impact (when the interviewee's tasks have included research):

The importance of the interviewee's research activities for his/her own professional development?

Has the museum been able to make use of the interviewee's research beyond individual projects, meaning have they had an effect on, e.g. the museum's research, collections, publications or exhibition policies?

How has the revival of the research paradigm (e.g. 'new art history') or postmodern attitudes affected the interviewee's own orientation/the museum's functions or policies (e.g. exhibition policies)/ the practices of the museum field in general?

In addition: It is worth paying attention to 'funny stories' from the interviewees' careers.

Interview attachments should include a complete CV from the interviewee.

APPENDIX 2: CONSENT AGREEMENT

(Translated by the author)

Contract concerning the Interviews for the Museum History Project

In 2005, a nationwide museum history project began, and an extensive interview project was launched with representatives of museum professions and cultural figures. Supporters of the campaign include the Finnish Museum Association, the Finnish Heritage Agency, the Finnish Museum of Natural History, the Finnish National Gallery (Central Archives of Fine Arts and Kehys) and the disciplines of museology at the universities of Helsinki, Jyväskylä and Turku. Museums are responsible for the interviews in their area, but the Finnish Heritage Agency, the Central Archives of Fine Arts (National Gallery) and the Finnish Museum of Natural History possess archive copies of the interviews.

The signatory

____

hereby approves the following arrangements for his/her recorded interview:

I approve the preservation of the recordings made by

____

Name of the Museum

in the museum in question, and the handing over of its archive copies to the Central Archives of Fine Arts of the National Gallery, the Finnish Heritage Agency or the Central Museum of Natural History.

Interview(s) carried out in:

____

Place and date

Interview recordings, the table of contents or transcripts of the interviews, as well as the interviewee's records or curriculum vitae may be used in research in accordance with the existing legislation pertaining to museums and archives and the Copyright Act. The interviewee will always receive a table of contents (summary and lists of names) of the interview, of which he / she accepts one copy with his / her signature for archiving purposes. The interview or parts of it may be published, while acknowledging the interviewee, in museum historical contexts and in university education and non-commercial communications involving electronic media, radio, television and cable network programmes. Restrictions on use of the former are marked with a strikethrough and supplemented in the 'remarks' section.

I want a copy of the recording to be delivered to the address below
Yes
No
Remarks

There are three identical copies of this agreement, held by the person interviewed, the museum that conducted the interview and the institution that maintains the sound archive.

____
Place and date

Signatures

Contact information

Signature____

On behalf of the Museum/Archive
Contact information:

Signature____

Acts: Act on the Openness of Government Activities (621/1999), Personal Data Act (523/1999) and current archive and copyright legislation.

APPENDIX 3: QUESTIONNAIRE 'MY MUSEUM MEMORIES'
(Translated by the author)

MY MUSEUM MEMORIES

Why did you visit a museum?
Have museum visits shaped your worldview? Tell us about your own museum visit!

The questionnaire is intended for all ages — young people and adults. We hope you will share your museum experiences in as personal a manner as possible. Tell us what it is like to visit a museum in your hometown or at a holiday destination in Finland or abroad.

Instructions

- Write your free-form report on a white A4 sheet of paper, on one side of the paper only. Leave a margin of approx. 4 cm on the left edge and approx. 1 cm on the right edge for archiving purposes. Do not use stickers, tape or staples.
- Write your background information on a different sheet of paper: name, address, phone number; education and professional training (including any previous training); the date and place of birth and your signed consent for the material you submit to be archived in your name for research use in the Finnish Literature Society's archive.
- Send your responses by 31 May 2008 to the Finnish Literature Society, PO Box 259, FI-00171 Helsinki or by e-mail to keruu@finlit.fi. In the subject field of the envelope or message, include the notation 'My museum memory'. Respondents will be awarded with book prizes.

Do you remember the first time in your life that you visited a museum? Why did you go to the museum? What did you see and experience? What kind of story did the museum tell? What was the name of the exhibition, in which museum was it and when?

Tell us what kind of museums you like to visit. Also, talk about your visits to open-air museums, historic parks, fortresses, mansions, burial sites or archaeological sites, including, e.g. ancient remains. Reports on visits to a site or nature reserve designated as a national landscape are also welcome.

Also report any disappointments associated with such visits and assess why the museum visit did not meet your expectations. Tell us why a museum can be boring, or explain why something feels annoying, or why museums don't interest you at all. What kind of museum exhibition would you find attractive and interesting?

Tell us where your interest in museums came from, and do you have any hobbies or engage in work that supports your interest in museums? What sort of meaning do your parents or other people, school, library or other community have for your relationship with museums? Have your interests changed over time? What fascinates you about museums?

***

A nationwide museum history project is underway, the aim of which is to write a history of Finnish museums. Finnish museum history outlines our relationship to culture and our material, natural and artistic heritage.

More information: Finnish Museum Association,
http://www.museoliitto.fi/projektit/ajankohtaisetprojektit

Organisers of the questionnaire: The National Gallery, the Finnish Heritage Agency, the Finnish Museum of Natural History and the Finnish Museum Association, in cooperation with the Finnish Literary Society.